

the Army received in the office of the Inspector General during the past fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 1559); to the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department and ordered to be printed.

8. A letter from the Board of Managers, transmitting annual report of the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1918 (H. Doc. No. 1560); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

9. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting statement of expenditures in Department of Commerce for the fiscal year 1918 (H. Doc. No. 1561); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Commerce and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. SULZER, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 95) to provide for agricultural entries on coal lands in Alaska, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 843), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. TREADWAY: A bill (H. R. 13273) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department," approved September 2, 1914, and an act in amendment thereto, approved October 6, 1917; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DENT: A bill (H. R. 13274) to provide relief where formal contracts have not been made in the manner required by law; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GREEN of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 13275) to amend section 1754 of title 19, of the Revised Statutes of the United States, 1878, giving preference to honorably discharged soldiers and sailors for appointments to civil positions; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. HEFLIN: A bill (H. R. 13276) to amend the act known as the "United States cotton futures act," approved August 11, 1916, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SISSON: A bill (H. R. 13277) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes; to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. ROGERS: A bill (H. R. 13278) to amend the act of Congress of February 17, 1911, entitled "An act providing for the purchase or erection, within certain limits of cost, of embassy, legation, and consular buildings abroad"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McKEOWN: A bill (H. R. 13279) granting a gratuity to every honorably discharged officer, soldier, and marine in the Navy of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KINKAID: A bill (H. R. 13280) to amend section 2 of an act entitled "An act to provide further for the national security and defense by encouraging the production, conserving the supply, and controlling the distribution of those ores, metals, and minerals which have formerly been largely imported, or of which there is or may be an inadequate supply"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McKEOWN: A bill (H. R. 13281) to grant to every honorably discharged soldier the uniform in his possession at the time of his discharge and granting a gratuity to the members of the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 13282) granting a pension to George J. Bock; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13283) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Myers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13284) granting an increase of pension to S. F. Fowler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DARROW: A bill (H. R. 13285) granting a pension to Emma E. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOULD: A bill (H. R. 13286) granting a pension to John Finnerty; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HASTINGS: A bill (H. R. 13287) for the relief of E. K. White; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KRAUS: A bill (H. R. 13288) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Pefley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORES of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 13289) granting a pension to Mary V. Sterling; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORGAN: A bill (H. R. 13290) granting an increase of pension to Noah Ruhl; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY: A bill (H. R. 13291) granting an increase of pension to John Read; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SNOOK: A bill (H. R. 13292) granting a pension to Michael Levi; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of members of Ruggles Grange, of New London, Ohio, protesting against the so-called zone system; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Resolution and suggestions of the Philadelphia Bourse, for the upbuilding of an American merchant marine; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DARROW: Resolutions and suggestions of the Philadelphia Bourse, for the upbuilding of an American merchant marine; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MOORES of Indiana: Petition of a mass meeting of citizens of Indianapolis, with regard to Irish emancipation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MCKINLEY: Resolutions by citizens of Decatur, Ill., relating to the anti-Jewish atrocities committed in Galicia, Roumania, and Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, December 9, 1918.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. KITCHIN.

The Rev. Earle Wilfley, pastor of Vermont Avenue Christian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thou whose holiest and tenderest name to us is Father, before Thy throne this morning we come to make our peace with Thee and to win from Thee Thy guiding blessing. May this be a good day for truth and justice and right, and Thy holy spirit attend us. Make us think aright, plan, purpose, and act aright. Lord, we pray Thy blessing upon our country and all its holy interests, and in this day, fraught with so many possibilities, may we be true to our own better selves, true to our country's interests, and to Thy great cause.

We ask it for Thy name's sake. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, December 7, 1918, was read and approved.

EULOGIES ON THE LATE SENATOR BROUSSARD.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Sunday, January 26, 1919, be set aside by the House for the purpose of paying tribute to the life, character, and public services of the late Senator R. F. BROUSSARD, of Louisiana.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Louisiana asks unanimous consent that Sunday, January 26, 1919, be set aside for eulogies on the late Senator BROUSSARD, of Louisiana. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

DAWSON SPRINGS SANATORIUM.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for two minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday last I called at the office of the Surgeon General of the United States Army—and that was during the argument on the Dawson Springs Hospital—and was there informed that an offer of a hotel at Dawson Springs had been made to the Government for a hospital, and that the offer had been refused. I at that time told the officer who told me that I would not use his name. Afterwards, in conversation with the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr.

REAVIS], I told him of this circumstance, and he asked whether the information might be used. I told him it could, but the name of the officer could not be used, because I had given him my word it would not. Afterwards, in a controversy between the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. REAVIS], a rather embarrassing situation was presented, which I think it proper to clear up. This morning I went to the Surgeon General's office and am at liberty now to give the information. I informed Mr. REAVIS of this fact, and at the Surgeon General's office this morning I was informed that on the 19th day of June last Theodore Troendle, president of the Dawson Hotel Corporation, came to the Surgeon General of the United States and offered him a hotel owned by this corporation at Dawson Springs for the purpose of turning it into a hospital, which offer was considered by the Government, and finally the project was rejected by the Surgeon General. The information relative to this can be obtained from Col. Winford Smith, in the office of the Surgeon General, and he is the gentleman from whom I obtained the information. He has told me that I might use it on the floor of the House. I make this statement out of deference to and in order to relieve the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. REAVIS] of what is a somewhat embarrassing situation.

Mr. FOSTER. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Did they reject it on account of the location or on account of the building?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I am informed by Col. Smith, my only source of information, that about all the information he has is found in a card found in a card-index system in his office. I have given the facts as they substantially appear on this card. He says he does not remember the conversation accurately, though considerable material is filed in his office relative to the offer.

Mr. FOSTER. So he did not tell you he rejected it on account of the location at Dawson Springs or on account of the building?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. He told me they considered it and rejected it.

Mr. FOSTER. It might be on account of the building?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. It might be so.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. Wood of Indiana, indefinitely, on account of illness (at the request of Mr. VESTAL).

To Mr. ALEXANDER, for one day, on account of illness.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 13277, the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the District appropriation bill.

Mr. Sisson. And, Mr. Speaker, pending that I would like to ask the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS] if he has any suggestion to make as to general debate?

Mr. DAVIS. I have.

Mr. Sisson. How much time does the gentleman desire?

Mr. DAVIS. Thus far I have been approached for at least two hours and a half of general debate.

Mr. Sisson. Does not the gentleman think he might be able to cut that down a little?

Mr. DAVIS. And I am informed that they are still coming; but that is all up to date.

Mr. Sisson. Does not the gentleman believe that we might agree on three hours, an hour and a half on a side? Some of those gentlemen might cut their time.

Mr. DAVIS. I would like to agree on 30 minutes, so far as I am concerned, but the Members on this side of the House seem to want to do some talking, and objection has been made that they have not up to date had an opportunity to examine the printed bill. Hence they requested me to get as much time as possible in which to discuss it, and I am simply an organ through which to express their opinion at this time. I could not agree at this time to anything less than two hours and a half for my part of it.

Mr. Sisson. Would the gentleman agree to three hours, giving the gentleman's side two hours and our side having one hour?

Mr. HEFLIN. I will not agree to that.

Mr. DAVIS. I hardly think I can agree to less than two hours and a half. Perhaps some of the gentlemen will cut their time down. I cut one gentleman down 20 minutes.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate do not exceed five hours, two hours and a half to be controlled by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS] and two hours and a half to be controlled by myself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent that general debate be limited to five hours, two and a half hours to be controlled by himself and two and a half hours by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] will please take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 13277, the District of Columbia appropriation bill, with Mr. GARNER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 13277, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 13277) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make a brief statement. Gentlemen of the committee, I do not know that I can add anything to what you will find in the report. The clerk has made quite a clear report of what the bill contains. In fact, I have always believed that when the reports are accurate they frequently shorten the debate. Every Member of the House then, by reading the report, is able to determine what the changes are.

This bill apparently carries less money than has heretofore been carried, but as a matter of fact it does not do so. If the committee will give me its attention, I want to explain to you how it is that the bill apparently carries a million dollars less than last year and something over a million dollars less than has been estimated for by the commissioners. In the first place, we appropriated last year \$910,000 for public-school buildings, none of which has been expended. We appropriated in round figures something like a million dollars for streets. A good portion of that was for the repair of streets, and quite a good deal of that money has been expended, but none of the money to be expended for streets as original paving or to open up new streets, or, rather, to pave new streets where no pavement has been heretofore, has been used at all.

Now, your committee reappropriated all of the money for school buildings. As a matter of fact, that is not absolutely necessary, because under the law where the contracts are made they continue until completed. But in reference to streets we reappropriated all the money carried that is unexpended, so that for street purposes we shall have more money expended during the balance of this fiscal year and during the next fiscal year than has ever been expended in one year before in the city of Washington for streets.

I think that explanation is proper, because the streets have not been in good condition, first, because of the excessively heavy traffic. Heavy Army trucks have damaged the streets quite a good deal and the excessive use of the streets by traffic has caused a deterioration of the streets of Washington. No improvements could be made, because the District Commissioners could not get the necessary labor. The demand for labor in this market has been greater than ever before, and when the commissioners could get labor at all the cost was more than twice what it was before. Therefore as to building new streets and paving streets never paved before and tearing up the old streets which are badly worn, the commissioners did not do any of that work. The only thing they have tried to do was to keep in reasonable repair the streets of Washington so that they might be used, so that, as a matter of fact, you may add over \$1,500,000 to the amount carried in the bill in order to get an accurate idea of what will be expended on streets during the year which this bill covers.

Now, I want also to call your attention to the fact that a statement is made on page 2 of the report giving the surplus of the District of Columbia revenues on June 30, 1918. The surplus is \$3,280,685.46, to which is to be added the surplus for this year, so that on June 30, 1919, there will be a surplus of \$5,429,229.57. I want to call your attention particularly to this, because it involves the first item that we have placed in this bill. Now, from the figures I have named you will have to deduct whatever may be carried in a deficiency bill. As I understand, there will probably be some deficiency, running up, it may be, to \$200,000; but it is not at all probable that the deficiencies asked for will absorb the \$429,000 referred to. Therefore you will have a surplus in the District treasury of \$5,000,000 on that date.

Now, the taxation in the District of Columbia, upon a comparison of taxes in other cities, is very much less than the taxes paid in other cities. Take an amount of money invested in property in the city of Washington and the assessments placed upon that property and you will find that the rate is less than that in any city in the country of this size. All the cities throughout the United States, in addition to paying their municipal expenses proper—the only expenses that the District of Columbia pays—pay a State and county tax. Therefore, if you were to add to the city taxation in the various cities throughout the country the State and county taxes, you would find that in most cases they are more than double what the people of the District of Columbia pay.

Now, the proposition which we put in this bill is one which has repeatedly passed the House by overwhelming majorities. Every time it has been voted on in the House in the last number of years it has carried by about two votes to one. The proposition is, briefly, a perfectly simple one as carried in the bill. This proposition was prepared first by the gentleman who is now the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. SHERLEY]. That matter was taken up by the Committee on Appropriations, and the then chairman requested the present chairman to put into concrete form what the committee then agreed upon. So the proposition is not a new one. Now, some have the idea that we are endeavoring to place upon the District of Columbia a burden which she ought not to bear. I do not believe it is in the heart of a single Member of Congress to do that; but we have reached the point where we prophesied some years ago we would reach, although we reached it a little earlier than was prophesied, when, in this bill as coming from the commissioners, there will be a request of the proper committee to reduce the rate of taxation in the District of Columbia, because it is bringing in more money than the District of Columbia needs plus the amount that is paid out of the Federal Treasury. It is well now to look just a moment into the history of this matter. It has been gone into repeatedly, but in order to refresh your memory it is well enough to go into it. For quite a while they discussed the present organic act, so called. It was under the control of Mr. Blackburn, who was then a Member of the House, afterwards a distinguished Senator from the State of Kentucky. They then worked out the present system, with some modifications since made, of the Federal Treasury responding for 50 per cent of the expenses of the District. But you must take into consideration the fact that at that time when it was done there were less than 100,000 people in the District of Columbia, and under the so-called local government at that time the indebtedness of the District of Columbia was over \$40,000,000. Therefore, a city of that size could not shoulder the burden of that indebtedness and in addition keep up the city as it ought to be kept up as a capital city.

The bonds of the District were then considerably below par, and there was an effort being made to refund the bonds, but no purchasers could be had. Then it was that Congress took the matter up, went carefully into it, and as a gratuity to the District of Columbia undertook to refund in that organic act the bonds at 3.65, and they are what are now known as the 3.65 bonds. That bonded indebtedness has been paid off until it is now only about \$3,000,000, in round figures. We are paying \$900,000 a year on the bonds, so, I believe, in 1922 all these bonds will have been paid. The Federal Treasury has responded to 50 per cent of that indebtedness, which the Federal Government had nothing to do with creating. Not only that but the Federal Treasury has responded to the District for one-half of all the interest on these bonds during all these years. Not only that, the District gets a certain number of courts, and gets a certain amount of assistance from the Federal Treasury, where the activities are limited absolutely to the District of Columbia and her affairs but paid for wholly out of the Federal Treasury. But that perhaps is not different from the States, because you have the marshals and the Federal courts in the States. So, if anything is said about the relations of the States to the District of

Columbia our judgment, so far as the local taxes are concerned, should be identical with that of the States with reference to the private activities in the District of Columbia.

Now, it has been contended, and justly so as to the maintenance of the streets, that when L'Enfant laid out the streets of the Capital City he made those streets immensely wider and put in numbers of circles and numbers of points of land, necessitating sidewalks and streets, which no city except Washington has to respond to. But we have recognized that fact, because the Federal Government has taken over nearly all these points of land. It will be only a few years when all these so-called points will be taken over and will be cared for out of the Federal Treasury.

In addition to that all of the sidewalks around most of the public buildings of the Federal Government are paid for by the Federal Government. We maintain out of our Treasury the Capitol Grounds, all the parkings and streets in the Capitol Grounds. And when you take the benefits that the citizens of the District of Columbia get out of the location of the Federal Government here, you will find that they are greater than the benefits of any other people in the world, because they have a pay roll which is not affected by the crop conditions of the country, not affected by business panics, not affected by epidemics, because every salary is paid promptly every 15 days in the District of Columbia, and the average salaries paid to the employees of the Federal Government are certainly, in time of peace, greater than the average salaries paid anywhere else in the country.

Now, to show the benefit that they get from the Treasury I have mentioned these things, but that would be true wherever the Capital might be located, and I do not begrudge these people that benefit. But what the subcommittee and practically the full committee have asked for repeatedly is not that the people of this District should give up any benefits that accrue to them by virtue of the location of the Capital here, but that every taxpayer in the District of Columbia shall pay a reasonable tax upon his property, reasonably assessed, and that that shall end the contribution of the taxpayer to the expenses of the District of Columbia, and that whatever amount Congress desires to appropriate for the beautification of the National Capital shall then be paid out of the Treasury of the United States. That being true, under this bill the Federal Government will contribute nearly \$4,000,000 to the support of the District of Columbia, which I think is really more than its share, but I do not begrudge that. I call your attention to the fact that in the District of Columbia the taxpayers do not pay on a rate of taxation like that on which the people of the States pay, but this does not disturb that rate of taxation. This does not disturb the property valuation in the District of Columbia. During the next current year, and until legislation shall change it, the rate of taxation and the rule of assessment will be identical the same as now, and unless a man's property is increased in amount, no resident of the District of Columbia will pay a cent more next year under this bill than he pays now. It does not increase his taxes one dollar.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. Along that line I want to know what the rate is here in the District of Columbia as compared with other tax rates?

Mr. SISSON. Of course it varies in the different States; but in the District of Columbia a tax of $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent is fixed upon a two-thirds valuation. That is to say, the 1 per cent rate is fixed on real property and upon what they call visible personal property; that is, they pay 1 per cent on a full valuation and $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent on a two-thirds valuation.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. What is the tax on mortgages, bonds, stocks, and so forth?

Mr. SISSON. Choses in action, three-tenths of 1 per cent.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. It is very much lower than in the States?

Mr. SISSON. Very much lower. In the States choses in action and solvent accounts, invisible personal property, as it is designated in this bill, have to pay a tax on a full valuation in most States. But in the District of Columbia they only pay one-third of 1 per cent. Now, I will say to the gentleman from Maryland that there are no such taxes in Baltimore. The taxes there are a little more in the city than they are here, and in addition they pay a State and county tax. A resident of the city of Baltimore pays on a dollar invested in Baltimore twice as much as they pay in this city.

Mr. LINTHICUM. We pay 15 mills as a city tax and then the State and county tax in addition.

Mr. SISSON. Baltimore and the county are practically the same.

Mr. LINTHICUM. No; Baltimore and St. Louis are the only cities that have an absolutely distinct corporation.

Mr. SISSON. But you do not have a county separate from the city; the city takes it all.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Absolutely.

Mr. TOWNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. TOWNER. In addition to what the gentleman has said, we have, notwithstanding the lowest rate of taxation in the country, perhaps the largest surplus of any other city in the country.

Mr. SISSON. I do not know of a city that has as much surplus as they have in the city of Washington. We have so much, and it is growing so rapidly that, notwithstanding we have the lowest taxation of any city in the United States, notwithstanding the fact that by virtue of the half that we have contributed from the Federal Treasury that surplus is growing so rapidly that they are here now asking the Congress to reduce that low rate of taxation.

Mr. TOWNER. Certainly there is no excuse for any dereliction in the performance of the duties that the District is required to keep up the streets.

Mr. SISSON. No; nothing in the world.

Mr. TOWNER. Will the gentleman allow me to call attention to this fact, which I think can be proven by any Member of the House? I do not think there ever was a time, not since I have been in the city of Washington, when the streets were as dirty or when they were so dangerous as they are now. On yesterday—Sunday—with the streets full going up and down the Avenue, I drove from one end to the other, and I venture to say that there is not a principal street in any city of any size in the United States that was as dirty as Pennsylvania Avenue was on yesterday. It is a disgrace to the city of Washington, and it is a disgrace to the country.

And on every day, almost, from 5 o'clock until 7 o'clock it is unsafe for women or children to be on the streets of Washington because of the fact that almost everyone seems to be riding or driving with an automobile and driving at an excessive rate of speed, violating every day on every street in hundreds and thousands of instances the ordinances of the city. It certainly seems to me that these conditions ought to be remedied.

Mr. SISSON. I do not suppose the gentleman heard the statement which I made as to the streets in my opening remarks. I referred to the fact that we appropriated last year every dollar asked for streets. We did not appropriate for opening up out in the suburbs for certain real estate activities some of the streets asked for, but every dollar for laying new pavements where the old was worn out, every dollar asked for resurfacing all streets, laying new pavements, was granted. The statement is made by the commissioners, and we all know it to be true, that it was physically impossible to get labor.

Not only that, but you could not get the War Board to release the material, the raw material, and therefore none of the appropriation for new pavement has been expended. A great deal of the last year's appropriation bill is carried over and carried in this bill as a reappropriation. Therefore having given in this bill every dollar asked for by the commissioners, we reappropriate all the money carried in last year's bill not expended, all carried over because no new streets were laid. A great deal of resurfacing is carried over, and we also give them every dollar for resurfacing at this time. And by the way, the District Commissioners say that this is all that they can spend. We give them all they can spend in one year for streets.

Mr. LITTLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. Certainly.

Mr. LITTLE. Does the lack of labor extend to lack of policemen in checking the speed of automobiles?

Mr. SISSON. There has been a time when they had much difficulty in getting policemen because many were taken into the Army and Navy and into various war activities. The result was that when they tried to get men of proper physical strength and proper physical condition they were unable to do so. There have been hundreds of places vacant, and they will tell any of you that if you will bring a man they will be liberal of examination and would take him. Maj. Pullman says he has taken a number of policemen that he would not have taken in peace times. They have requested that a certain number of soldiers be taken to police the city and a certain number have been detailed.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. Has the full amount asked to keep the streets clean been given?

Mr. SISSON. Yes; every dollar. By the way, you know they had a strike in that class of labor of short duration, for cleaning

the streets, and it has been very difficult to get sufficient labor to clean the streets of the District because the demand was so great that the District Commissioners, although they paid twice as much a day as they did formerly, could not get them. And that is one reason that that appropriation was not sufficient perhaps to carry on the street cleaning, and I think there is going to be a deficiency in that particular, but this bill does not cover deficiencies, of course. But the streets referred to a moment ago by my friend from Iowa, if they have not been as clean as they ought to be, it has been because it cost twice as much to get the labor, and I am afraid that we are getting about half as much labor out of each laborer.

Mr. DENISON. Does the gentleman know what pay these men now get for cleaning the streets?

Mr. SISSON. They pay, I think, about \$3.20 to \$3.40 for eight hours.

Mr. DENISON. When that question came up before the Committee on Labor, of which I was a member in the last session of Congress, it was shown that a great many of these men were working for \$60 a month.

Mr. SISSON. Not for that class of labor, because they are paid on a per diem basis. They get from \$1.60 as I recall—and I hope the gentleman will not bind me to the absolute figures, and members of the subcommittee will correct me—I think at that time they got from \$1.60 to \$1.70 a day, but their wages have been practically doubled, and these \$60 kind were not the street-cleaning men.

Mr. WHEELER. If the gentleman will yield, on page 25 the appropriation for garbage is \$621,000. That is a considerable increase over the last appropriation by about \$200,000.

Mr. SISSON. I will show that in a moment. That is a matter of bookkeeping. It really costs less to take care of the garbage.

Mr. WHEELER. It seems to be an increase over the appropriation for last year.

Mr. SISSON. It cost about \$75,000 to \$80,000 the preceding year to take care of the garbage. We will get it this year for about \$135,000 or \$140,000. We take over the garbage plant, and this apparent increase is a bookkeeping matter. I want to call attention also to the fact that in this bill we increase the salaries of the District Commissioners from \$5,000 to \$6,000. They did not ask for any increase for the last two or three years. Part of that time, I do not know that the present commissioners have ever asked for an increase, but we looked this matter up and found that the salaries of the District Commissioners were fixed in 1878, when they had about 60,000 or 70,000 people in the District of Columbia. Since that time their duties have increased quadruple, and I do not know of any three gentlemen in Washington who have more arduous duties and more hard work than these District Commissioners, and while some members of the committee did not think perhaps we had increased them enough, we finally unanimously agreed to increase their salaries from \$5,000 to \$6,000 a year. Now, in addition to their duties as commissioners, they are a utility commission, too, and during the last three or four years they have had an enormous amount of work to do as a utility commission in valuing plants under that act which we passed by which we caused the valuation of railroads throughout the country.

Mr. WHEELER. Has there been any decrease in salaries in this bill, as, for instance, police drivers and patrolmen; did not they receive \$120 more than what this bill provides?

Mr. SISSON. I will state when we get to that proposition. There are no decreases in salaries.

Mr. WHEELER. According to this bill, there must be decreases.

Mr. SISSON. No; not in salaries. We have not put the \$120 in. I will explain that. Well, I had just as well get at it now. I want the committee to understand the situation which we found ourselves in. All the departments of the Government, including the District of Columbia, by executive order were required to submit estimates for increase in salaries to the Executive and through the Executive to come in one budget to the House. Now, as a matter of fact, that can not be done under the law, and the chairmen of the various committees, after consultation with the members of various subcommittees, agreed that it would perhaps not be fair to the Government at that time to undertake to fix the basic salary, and therefore we will endeavor to take care of any injustice that might be done by the so-called low salaries and take it up in a separate resolution as we did before the question of increase for the current year. That is how we got the \$120, not in the bill, but in a separate resolution. So that matter has not been considered by your committee.

Mr. LITTLE. Have we lost any commissioners by reason of the size of the salaries or the character of the work?

Mr. SISSON. No; we have lost none of the commissioners. I do not think that either one of the commissioners would resign, if the gentleman wants to put it that way, on that account.

Mr. LITTLE. If the gentleman from Mississippi will permit, the salary is almost as large as that of a Member of Congress, and are not Members of Congress at much greater expense than these residents are?

Mr. SISSON. I do not think that they are.

Mr. LITTLE. Where does the gentleman board?

Mr. SISSON. It is a question of economy. If we economize, we do not spend as much. The gentleman and myself are economical, and we get along with our salaries and we do not spend carelessly, but still we get \$7,500.

Mr. LITTLE. The gentleman is talking for himself in saying how well we get along on the salary in this town at this time.

Mr. SISSON. And in addition to the \$7,500 we get the perquisites, such as mileage, stationery account, and so forth.

Mr. LITTLE. If the gentleman will permit, we are not all like him. He has only 4,000 votes cast, whereas in our district we have 85,000 and—

Mr. SISSON. I am afraid if we had to put the salaries so as to enable men to pay their campaign expenses that we would have to increase—

Mr. LITTLE. We spend a great deal of money in many ways besides campaigns. The gentleman has only 4,000 votes cast in his district, and he is not troubled very much with correspondence from people who do not take enough interest in public questions to vote. Eighty-five thousand people who vote and take an active interest in public affairs devolve on a Member twenty times as much correspondence and twenty times as great responsibilities as fall to one who is sent here by only 4,000.

Mr. SISSON. As a matter of fact, that is the vote that is cast in the general election. Come down to the primaries and I will show you a different story.

Now, all the other increases in salary have been for some minor places. For instance, we increased the salary of some nurses who were getting \$1,000. Graduate nurses get \$1,200 throughout the country, and your committee increased the salary of nurses here to that amount.

Now, just a word as to public schools. We gave last year every school-teacher asked for. We also gave them portable buildings, which are being constructed—and I presume a great many have been already constructed—to take care of the overflow of children. Now, we could not complete the school buildings in two or three years necessary to take care of the children. They could not get the material and could not get the labor. Therefore the Congress last year authorized the construction of portable buildings. This year in order to take care of the surplus children we have increased that appropriation \$87,000 to erect portable buildings.

Mr. LINTHICUM. How much are you paying the school-teachers?

Mr. SISSON. We are paying the school-teachers now more than is paid in any city in the United States, even including Boston, which pays the highest salaries for teachers of any city in the United States.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I know; but they are not getting sufficient in most of the cities of the country, and I wanted to know how much they get here.

Mr. SISSON. The District of Columbia can not cure all the ills outside of the District.

Mr. LINTHICUM. With the great surplus you have on hand and the taxes so light, I was wondering why you did not pay your school-teachers sufficient salary.

Mr. SISSON. I will tell you. In the first place, we have the longevity law, which fixes it, and the Appropriation Committee undertook at one time to go into that matter, but it is one of the most difficult of all the tasks one could undertake to figure out the longevity law and exactly where you are at. Because under the longevity provision the teachers teaching five years have a certain amount added to their salary, and then when they go from a certain class to another, from A to B, or from B to A—I get it confused in my mind—where the base pay is higher than the base pay where they have been teaching five years, when they go up to that base pay they do not give up the longevity. If the original base pay plus the longevity is more than the base pay in the succeeding higher grade, the teachers get less. So you can not tell by looking at this bill or by looking at the longevity law what the school-teachers in the city of Washington are actually getting.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Who does know?

Mr. SISSON. It is figured out by the auditor and by the clerk of the board of education, who keeps the teachers' entire record. But you will find in this bill an item of something

like \$400,000 to care for longevity pay. So you can add \$400,000 to what you see in the bill for teachers' salaries and see what they are actually getting.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman find out exactly the amount paid for teachers' salaries? I would like to know.

Mr. SISSON. That is quite a task.

Mr. LINTHICUM. There must be some base salary.

Mr. SISSON. If you go back to the base law, \$720 is the lowest basic salary now paid in the District of Columbia. Then you can add to that whatever the longevity pay is. Up until your present subcommittee took the whole matter in hand some of the salaries of the minor teachers were as low as \$500, and a great many \$600. We have increased it so that the base pay is \$720. But that does not tell the story. Because they begin on \$720, plus the \$120 we gave them, and that was taken into consideration last year, and it makes the lowest salary \$840 for nine months' work.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Seventy dollars a month?

Mr. SISSON. You are taking 12 months. The gentleman must take into consideration the fact that that is the base pay of the teacher and does not include all the other. I agree with the gentleman that throughout the United States the teachers' salaries are very small, but the people back in the States—the people in your State—have not seen fit to increase their salaries as radically as they have been increased here.

Mr. LINTHICUM. We have increased our salaries very largely, but we have not this great surplus and this living under the eye of Uncle Sam that you have here.

Mr. SISSON. There is no great surplus, as the gentleman knows, in the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I mean to the credit of the District of Columbia. There is over \$5,000,000, is there not?

Mr. SISSON. As a matter of fact, that is a bookkeeping account, and the lawyers differ as to whether or not that is a claim that the District of Columbia may make against the Federal Treasury. Some lawyers claim that is collected and paid into the Treasury the same as the other and becomes a part of the funds of the Treasury. I am not expressing an opinion about it. I have some definite opinions, but do not care to encumber the RECORD about it, but that money paid into the Treasury does not represent the ability of the Federal Treasury to respond. And when I pay out the money of the Federal Treasury to the officials and to the employees of the Government, just as it is paid out to pay the employees in the city of Baltimore, I want it understood that the Federal Treasury ought not to bid against Baltimore and ought not to bid against all the communities throughout the United States, when you are bidding with their money. We have got to be fair; we have got to be just to the Treasury, and at the same time fair and just with the employees and with the school-teachers.

Now, I want to call your attention also to a provision that the committee put into the bill enabling the District of Columbia to avail itself of any property which the Government of the United States bought during the war which would become useless; for instance, typewriters, trucks, automobiles, where automobiles are used in the District of Columbia—in the fire department and in the water department—and the typewriters that may be used. We put in a provision here which authorizes the officials of the District government to buy from the Federal Government at a price not to exceed the price paid by the Government for these things, and, if they have been used, to pay not more than a reasonable price, taking into consideration their use. In that way we felt that the District of Columbia might get those things which it needs and which it has to buy very much more cheaply, and therefore when that is done they do not have to go into the open market or let bids for those matters, and they are not restricted by the regulations when they buy actually from the Government.

Then we also put a provision in the bill to the effect that the board of education should be selected by the District Commissioners. For many years the board of education has been selected by the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia. Every member of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia says that he ought not to be burdened with that job. Every one of them says that. And, by the way, a gentleman formerly a Member of this House, and at one time one of the distinguished members of that court, makes a very strong argument as to why it should not be done. But it goes further than the fact that they never pay any attention to the schools. They have no way of going into the schools and no control of it except the mere selection of the board of education, and they would forget it but for the fact that some member of the school board calls their attention to it; and, not having given the school system any study and not knowing much about it, they must depend upon the recommendations made by the District Commissioners. With

the exception of the school board, all the other officials are selected by the District Commissioners.

This item was put in the bill once before and went out in the Senate, but at that time there was an organized fight made against it by the teachers of the District of Columbia. I understand now, however, that many members of the board of education openly express themselves as saying that the schools of the District would fare infinitely better if the appointing power of the board of education was the power that came before the congressional committee and made the statements with reference to the schools and looked after the financial statements, because the District Commissioners and the District officials have to look after all the financial statements of the schools and audit the accounts and everything of that sort. It is a peculiar history to get into as to why it was that the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia made the appointments. Perhaps it is better at this time not to go into that history. But we believe that that is proper, and we believe that almost all of the business activities of the District of Columbia believe that it is wise, so that your committee puts that in.

We also amended the law in reference to the construction of bridges across railroads so as to include the building of a bridge across the canal. Some of the bridges are necessary now to be built across the canal, and there is some doubt as to the authority to assess the canal company with the actual cost of the bridges across their physical property. I wanted to call your attention to that because that is a matter of legislation.

We also put a little amendment into the bill authorizing the District Commissioners to prescribe a schedule of fees for the examination of buildings, and so forth, but especially in reference to the inspection of elevators. There was some question raised as to the right to charge for the inspection of an elevator after it was installed.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. Sisson. In a moment. Most of the hotels and business houses that have had elevators to inspect have gone on and paid the fees without question, but some question has been raised as to the right to charge them anything except for the first installation inspection. We all know that we want the elevators inspected at stated intervals, and the District Commissioners think they should be examined at least once in a quarter, and they want to charge, as they have heretofore been doing, the cost of actual inspection, and we have given them authority. Now I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WALSH. Referring to the appointment of the board of education, I understood the gentleman to say that he did not care to go into the reasons why the power to select them was conferred upon the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia. Now, if you are going to make a change, I should think we ought to know why.

Mr. Sisson. It is a good long history to tell you.

Mr. WALSH. I do not mean any long history, but could not the gentleman state it briefly?

Mr. Sisson. As a matter of fact, they once had a condition here where all the people of the District of Columbia voted, and they had what they called a "feather-duster legislature." That was prior to the time when the Federal Government took over the government of the District of Columbia. Then they thought that local politics entered into it entirely too much. Therefore they put the burden upon the supreme court judges simply of selecting the board of education.

Mr. WALSH. It is a relic of the old times?

Mr. Sisson. Yes; it is a relic of old times.

Now, I believe, gentlemen, that that about concludes the statement that I desired to make.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Sisson. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. You were speaking of the changes you recommended in the laws in certain matters. Do you not think there should be some change in reference to the automobile laws and regulations that you passed, by which you make every Marylander coming into town procure a license and pay the amount that the citizen in the District pays?

Mr. Sisson. Does not the citizen of the State of Maryland pay the same as in the District?

Mr. LINTHICUM. He does, and the State of Maryland has provided \$24,000,000 worth of roads for the comfort of the people.

Mr. Sisson. The gentleman must know that it is not within the province of this body to change that law, and only in cases where, in consultation with the other committee and matters that intimately affect appropriations, has this committee undertaken to change the law.

Mr. LINTHICUM. This does affect the revenues of the District.

Mr. Sisson. Well, we are collecting the same revenues now from the issuance of automobile licenses as heretofore, but the license is very small in the District of Columbia as compared with other States.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Sisson. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. Do I understand the gentleman to state that there was a time when the people voted here and that there was a legislature of some kind? Will the gentleman state when that was?

Mr. Sisson. The act of 1878 took over the government of the District. That was when that went into effect. Prior to that time they had a legislature. That is not a very inviting bit of the history of the District of Columbia. That was during the régime of Gov. Shepherd. Whether Gov. Shepherd was a good man or a bad man I do not know. There are two sides to that. There was quite a controversy about that.

When we had that government here the District of Columbia affairs got in very bad shape. They ran it \$40,000,000 into debt, the bonds were sold very much below par; indeed the time was pretty near at hand when they would have to refund some of these bonds, and there was no sale for them. At that time Blackburn in the House and Blaine in the Senate are the names that I find intimately connected with this matter. They took it up and had this organic act passed, I think in 1878, and then that act was amended several times immediately after that. Prior to that time they had a vote in the District of Columbia, and the citizens of the District voted for the legislature of the District of Columbia, and that legislature, with a governor, controlled the city very much as a State is controlled.

Mr. DENISON. But prior to that law, briefly, what was the plan of taxation here? Did the Federal Government pay any part of it?

Mr. Sisson. No; nothing at all; not a dollar.

Mr. CANNON. Will my friend allow me just a word?

Mr. Sisson. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman speaks of Gov. Shepherd and the debt of the District. I came here in the Forty-third Congress, and that was the time that Gov. Shepherd went out, as I recall. He went out seemingly under a cloud, but there was investigation after investigation, and they resulted in unanimous reports justifying Gov. Shepherd. Then came the legislation for the half-and-half proposition. Gov. Shepherd went to Mexico a bankrupt, lived down there for many years, and finally came back and had a great reception. He laid the foundation upon which was built the present city of Washington. Of course, those men are all dead and gone. When Shepherd became governor of this District Washington had the dry rot, and he inaugurated a new era, possibly with a waste of money here and there, and there was the devil to pay and no pitch hot, but finally, by the action of the people and with their approval, there was erected in honor of Gov. Shepherd the bronze statue down on Pennsylvania Avenue, which shows him standing there in his cutaway coat, and I have no doubt that he is entitled to much of the credit for the greater Washington of to-day and of the future.

Mr. Sisson. I am not endeavoring to take from Gov. Shepherd any of the credit that may be due him. I simply stated that there was quite a controversy. A great many people contended that Gov. Shepherd was a great benefactor to the District and a great many people contended otherwise. But there is this to be said about Gov. Shepherd: You know L'Enfant made the plan for the city of Washington. As I understand it, George Washington employed L'Enfant, a great architect and landscape gardener, and he laid off the District with an eye to its defense. These circles were intended to be the site of forts, and if you will study the map of the District you will find that by putting cannon in these circles they command every street, and you can not get out of a street into an avenue without coming under the range of the cannon. In that way he proposed to defend the Capitol and the White House from any invasion. But up until Shepherd's time, as I understand it, nothing had been done toward carrying out the L'Enfant plans, and Washington was growing up very much like Topsy.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. Sisson. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I think also history tells us that L'Enfant made the little squares and circles with radiating avenues to meet such emergencies as confronted the French Government during the French Revolution.

Mr. Sisson. During the French Revolution; yes, for the purpose of defending the city from a mob.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. L'Enfant actually saw what happened over there in Paris at that time, he being there at the time of the French Revolution.

Mr. SISSON. Now, gentlemen of the committee, I have said all that I desire to say, because all other matters are simply matters of detail. They are mentioned in the report, and I want to congratulate the clerk of the committee, Mr. Shields, on the very splendid report he has gotten out, because Members may be assured of being informed what we have done, if they will read that report.

I want to say in conclusion that I believe it to be the duty of every Member of Congress now to help unscramble the eggs. It is a very easy matter to scramble eggs, but a very hard matter to unscramble them. Now, the task that lies immediately before us is to help the War Department and Navy Department cut off useless expenditures, and cut off those activities of the Government that ought not to be continued since the war is at an end. That is quite a task. There are going to be many people who will want to continue in their present employments. There will be many efforts made to justify their employment, and Congress desires to cut, but it ought to cut with the skill of the surgeon. We ought not to cut off necessary activities, but we ought to cut off wisely every unnecessary activity of the Government, and we must get back into our peaceful lines. We have surrendered into the hands of the Executive and the War and Navy Departments powers unheard of, and so far as I am individually concerned I want to get back to the peace times, if possible to get back where we were, and if any changes are necessary let them be made deliberately in time of peace and not under the spur of war. [Applause.]

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield for a question there?

Mr. SISSON. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DENISON. I should like to ask the gentleman from Mississippi if he knows what is going to be done with these buildings and with this great, high smokestack down here on the Plaza between the Capitol and the Union Station? They are still working on those buildings. Can the gentleman give the House any information about them?

Mr. SISSON. I understand that the work has been abandoned there, except where a building was about completed. The gentleman asks me what they are going to do with them. I do not know. I have no idea what they are going to do with them. They might turn them over to the House Members of Congress at a small rental if they desire to do so. [Laughter.] They might also use those buildings down on the Plaza for the purpose of bringing down somewhat the rents and hotel rates which we are all paying here. At any rate, the buildings are there, and I can not tell you what they are going to use them for. The committee are not considering all of these matters, and I hope the Appropriations Committee, after they have gone carefully into the facts, will be able to help the gentleman find something to do with them. We are ready to take any suggestion from the gentleman from Illinois as to what ought to be done with them.

Mr. DENISON. I would be glad to give them at a later date, but I am interested in the gentleman's views on any question. He has mentioned about unscrambling the eggs. Can the gentleman give us his idea as to what should be done with the railroads?

Mr. SISSON. I do not desire to go into the proposition at this time, although I have some definite and positive views myself on the question. That has nothing to do with this bill. At the proper time I will be glad to deliver myself upon that subject.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. As long as the gentleman has given us his ideas upon some things, does not the gentleman think that something ought to be done with reference to the Saulsbury resolution by which so many people, not war workers, have taken advantage of? I know a number of cases where people not connected with war work have taken advantage of that resolution.

Mr. SISSON. I will say by way of explanation as to the reason I mentioned it at all is because every one of the war activities has been cut out of this bill. We have not left one, but have cut the bill down to a peace basis. I thank gentlemen for their attention. [Applause.]

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PARKER].

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I have thought it right at this time to break my rule to speak only on the bill before the House. It seems to me at this time that it is my duty to bring before the House a dispassionate review of the question of a league of nations regarded simply in the light of the history of such a league.

When I say league of nations, Mr. Chairman, I desire not to be misunderstood. The league that has been proposed and urged lately is a definite thing, a general league of all nations for mutual defense, with the understanding that armament should be reduced, that trade conditions given by each to the other should be equal, and that there should be some sort of a general council meeting regularly and able to deal with the affairs of nations. Such a league is proposed in the message of the President of the United States of January 8 last. It is proposed definitely and it should not be confused with an entirely different sort of league of a few nations—that is to say, what is generally termed as an alliance. It has been said by President Taft in to-day's papers that he favors such an alliance or league between England, France, Italy, Japan, and America, as the five great powers, for the purpose of the settlement of conditions of peace. Such an alliance at the peace table is necessary. But I hope with Washington, in his Farewell Address, that we shall steer clear of permanent alliances anywhere, and, as he says, that temporary alliances will serve the purpose. Such a temporary alliance or understanding by which Japan and the United States back up the countries really interested in settling a peace in Europe upon proper terms will be supported by the people of the United States.

The President's address was made in January, before Russia was under the bolsheviks; before it could be said, as it is in the paper that came out this noon, that Russian red leaders are to head the Berlin extremists; before Austria had broken down so that it no longer can make any treaty; before questions of boundaries had come up which will disturb all Europe unless they are settled. Nations of central Europe are to be established, taking them away from Germany and Austria and from Russia wherever they consist of people who were not Germans or friendly to them, so as to make the map of Europe, as I hold it in my hand, almost a Chinese puzzle, with Finland, Livonia, Lithuania, Poland, Czecho-Slovaks, Greater Roumania, Ukraina, Jugo-Slovaks, Greater Bulgaria, and Roumania, all new nations in prospect, that have no connection with one another, no legislatures, no laws, and no government, and for whom governments must be established. These nations, proposed in the President's address of which I have spoken, can not be regarded now as realities who can join a league.

The great crisis is upon us by which the allies, as the leading nations, must settle the boundaries of government as best they can for these new nations and leave their fate to be taken care of by a wise Providence hereafter.

That address says that Germany is to be a part of the scheme for a league of nations. What, when the German Armies have gone home intact to be disbanded, but with an organization that can be called together within three days while we have to take nearly as many years to get overseas—are we to agree that all nations shall now disband? The allies must reserve power until the settlement of peace be made. We will talk about that afterwards.

When we tell Germany to cough up \$40,000,000,000, or some sum of that sort, are we to leave her power by her army to say whether she will or not comply with this righteous demand to restore countries that have been wrongfully despoiled, or are we to see that the indemnity is paid, as Germany did with France in 1871, by keeping the Provinces of France until it was done?

In our newspapers to-day our great ex-President says that the only league now can be a small league of great nations, and that when a small league has restored peace it will expand into a great league. Do not let us confuse the two. The temporary league to do justice now is necessary. The general league of nations to abandon our self-government and our arms and ammunition, Navy, and diplomacy to treaty and an international council is another question. We desire to study in the light of experience whether this is something we ought to wish or to go for. One thing is perfectly certain. No matter what is to be in the future we know that in the past the central powers have been dangerous because of their ability to unite countries all around them together into a great moving military force, and no league that admits Germany to membership can be established which does not also carefully provide that she shall not be able to use the policy of peaceful penetration by her banks, her merchants, her men, her officers into Russia and Turkey and the whole country of the east, so as to get a much larger army than she had in the last war and to be able to throttle and take over the whole world. It is important that there shall not be perfect equality among nations in their trade conditions as long as that threat remains.

But I direct attention now only to the project of a general league of nations, which is admitted to be far in the future by our ex-President, although it has not been so admitted by the President of the United States. Conditions will make it certain

to him that a general equal league of nations is not possible now, impossible at the present moment.

Therefore I am considering the future possibility of such a general permanent alliance only in the light of the past. The form of such an association is defined in the President's address. It can be found and has been tried in an earlier league. In the fourteenth point it is defined as follows:

A general association of nations must be formed under specific covenants for the purpose of affording mutual guarantees of political independence and territorial integrity to great and small States alike.

Such an association would begin by a declaration somewhat as was contained in the league of American States known as the Confederation, as follows: That the member States of the league "severally enter into a firm league of friendship with each other for their common defense, the security of their liberties, and their mutual and general welfare, binding themselves to assist each other against all force offered to or attacks made upon them or any of them." That is the essence of a league of peace. It would in terms protect each member against any other State in or out of the league.

The President in his address says also that in any such league trade conditions should be equal among the members. The words were:

The removal, so far as possible, of all economic barriers and the establishment of an equality of trade conditions among all the nations consenting to the peace and associating themselves for its maintenance.

The words "the removal of all economic barriers" seem to go farther than equality of trade conditions, but it is explained by the President to mean only that each member of the league may impose what duties or other regulations it pleases provided, however, they be equal to all other members of the league. Now, it is interesting that the former league to which I have referred, our own Articles of Confederation, contains in its historic phraseology this:

The people of each State shall have free ingress and egress to and from the territory of any other State and shall enjoy therein all of the privileges of trade and commerce subject to the same duties, impositions, and restrictions as the inhabitants thereof, respectively.

While in a subsequent part of the paper, Article IX, it was provided that the league, the general league, should make no treaty "by which the several States shall be restrained from imposing such imposts and duties on foreigners as their own people are subject to, or from prohibiting the importation or exportation of any species of goods or commodities whatever."

It seems as if this article of 150 years ago had been drawn in order to carry out the President's suggestion.

Disarmament also seems to be a condition suggested by the President for such a league. He says, in the fourth point:

Adequate guaranties given and taken that national armaments will be reduced to the lowest point consistent with domestic safety.

Our Articles of Confederation, the historic league to which I have referred, provided:

No vessel of war shall be kept up in time of peace by any State except such number as shall be deemed necessary by the United States in Congress assembled (the joint council hereafter mentioned) for the defense of such State or its trade, nor shall any military force be kept up by any State in time of peace except such number only as shall be deemed requisite by the United States in Congress assembled to guarantee the force necessary for the defense of such State, but every State shall always keep up a well regulated and disciplined militia, sufficiently armed and accoutered, and shall provide and constantly have ready for use in public stores a due number of fieldpieces and tents and a proper quantity of arms, ammunition, and camp equipage.

It goes without saying that under these conditions the consent of the congress as general council of the league would be necessary, also to any special embassy or treaties by any State, or to any treaties between them, or to their engaging in war unless there was actual invasion or imminent danger of invasion by pirates, and it was so provided as would be necessary in any such league now.

This being so, any disputes as to boundaries and jurisdictions would necessarily have to be arranged by the joint council or congress and not by any of the particular States. A very careful provision was contained in the articles of league to which I refer, by which the disputants should be summoned to select a court, and that, failing so to do, the joint council might name three persons out of each of the member States, and the disputants should strike out the names until the number was reduced to 13; a court of 7 or 9 was drawn therefrom by lot, and it was left to the court to decide.

In Mr. Taft's proposition he states carefully that we must have a general court of the nations in order to settle boundaries, appointed by the five great powers.

It is hard to see how any less power than those of our confederation could be granted to any general league of nations if it is to amount to anything. It must have some legislative,

executive, and judicial powers to carry on business. And in order to do this the paper that I have spoken of—our Articles of Confederation—follows a plan for a congress or joint council that they would have to use in a league now, at least in substance. Article V provided that a congress should meet once a year, to be composed of several delegates from each member State, but which would have one vote only for each State, and that Congress (Article IX) should have sole power of determining on peace and war, of maintaining diplomatic relations and making treaties and governing the seas, to appoint an executive committee of one delegate from each member State to sit in recess to manage generally the affairs of the league, to estimate probable expenditures, to borrow and appropriate money, to build a navy, and to require each member State to furnish a quota of the army, according to its population or as the council might decide. Two-thirds of all the member States would have to agree to any resolution as to war, treaties, estimates, loans, or the raising of armies or a navy, and a majority of all the member States, or two-thirds of the executive committee, was required for everything else. Any charges for war and all other expenses that shall be incurred for the common defense or general welfare were to be defrayed out of the common treasury, which was to be supplied by the several members of the league in proportion to the value of property.

It is surprising how accurately and completely this historic league conforms to all the conditions suggested by the present proposers of a league of nations. It is surprising that its provisions have not been referred to in any of the discussions, because it ought to be familiar to us. This particular league was prepared with great care by our foremost statesmen in 1777. It is known as the Articles of Confederation of the United States of America when they were free and independent States and governments; and the only change I have made in phraseology has been in sometimes changing the word "congress" to "joint council" and the word "state" to "member of the league."

We have the precedent when the United States of America formed a league in 1777, which took effect in 1781, and which went down in absolute failure in 1787 to 1789 because it was found that the affairs of nations can not be carried on either by limiting the powers of the representatives of the various components of one people who ought to be one union, or by trying to tie together people who have nothing to do with one another, like tying Serbia and Bulgaria and the Balkan States to the United States of America.

The Articles of Confederation contain nothing else of importance, except declarations of rights already possessed or recognition of existing governmental agencies. At that time every man in every one of the former British Colonies had been a British citizen and able to go into every other colony with no restriction by immigration laws of his right to be regarded as a citizen there, and that same right was declared in the Articles of Confederation. But it was a mere declaration of what existed.

There was a provision for a general post office. We run one now without any difficulty all over the world by the postal union. It is not difficult to do. But it was only declaring what had existed before the Revolution under the British rule. We can not now agree, if we wish to maintain the purity of our citizenship, that citizens of any State in the world shall come here and be citizens because we happen to be in such a league. Think of the bolsheviks, the Russians, the Serbians, the Bulgarians, the Turks, and the Armenians being told they are all citizens of the United States! But because there was then a common British citizenship that league had a much better chance of getting along than any other that we can put up at the present time. And it seems dangerous, in view of our experience, to go into the question of promising that we will make a league, offensive and defensive, with all the world.

Mr. STEVENSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. If I have time. How much time have I left, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 40 minutes remaining.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. STEVENSON. I wanted to ask this: I notice in the league you are discussing that each power has an equal vote. Suppose we had a league in which Liberia is placed. Is it contemplated that Liberia shall have an equal vote with the United States, or what is the proposition to avoid that? I am just asking for information.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I will say that I have seen various propositions. The last proposal of Mr. Taft, which appears in to-day's newspapers, is that only the five central great powers shall rule the whole question and that the others shall come in as a sort of adjunct, to be arranged as the great

powers please. A proposition I read before that, in a book edited by Theodore Marburg, was that each of the great powers should have three delegates each and the rest one. Representation was a very complicated question, as you will remember, in framing the Constitution of the United States. The convention compromised by allowing the Senate to have equal representation from the States, great and small, and the House of Representatives to have a representation according to the population, taking three-fifths of the slaves.

This league of the United States Confederation, although they were on the same continent and subject to the same dangers and in war against the common enemy, was powerless to enforce contributions of troops or of money. "It"—the articles—"gave to the Confederation the power of contracting debts and at the same time withheld from it the power of paying them" (Curtis Constitutional History, Vol. I, p. 121). What is more, prompt decisions could not be had from a council or Congress in case of emergency. The whole thing proved to be a rope of sand, even between people with the same interests. The league was dying when it was replaced, as it could be, by the union of the people of the States. But that establishment by the people of direct governmental control over persons and property would neither be possible or desirable in a world's league.

Now, this league did not work with us, and why? Are the reasons likely to apply to the new proposition for a world league? Let us begin with the last matter, of the court to settle boundaries, because it had chief consideration in forming the federation. The great western territory of the United States had just been acquired from Great Britain as far as the Mississippi. We had claims on the territory of Spain down toward the Gulf. Those territories were the wealth of the country. Connecticut claimed directly back to the Mississippi by her grant. New York claimed the great regions occupied by the Indians as belonging to her and running over the same territory. Virginia claimed that she owned the whole Northwest Territory, and if the question had been determined according to law by any court there would have been endless hatred of one State by another.

Fortunately they never got into the court of the Confederation, for before the articles of the league of firm friendship were signed Maryland said she would not sign at all unless all the western lands were thrown into a common holding and should belong to the General Government for the benefit of all the States, and for the establishment of new States as soon as might be. She had no right there herself. You might say she was a "dog in the manger"; but she achieved the greatness of the United States by seeing that the various States could not have boundary difficulties against one another.

How is it now? If we had a world league of various nations, could they settle boundary questions in the Balkans? Would the Balkans be willing to allow it? We were not willing to leave Alaska to the rest of the world, because we felt that the boundary of the world wished to have free access through the channels that run through Alaska, and that we should not have a strip of shore. We insisted upon settling this by agreement. Would we allow Mexican questions and our difficulties there to go to an assembly composed of Europeans for determination? Are we to break down the Monroe doctrine? Would not the same difficulties come in now, and would anybody agree to anything going before a world's court?

I can not learn that during the six or nine years of the Confederacy a single question was brought before any court appointed by Congress under the terms of the Confederation, and yet there were a great many boundary questions between the States which were settled.

This is by the by. The boundaries of France, Poland, Italy, Belgium, and of the East are too important to those countries concerned to be left to any world's court of distant and careless nations. They must be settled now before the peace, and not afterwards, in order to have firm government. One of the disputes between Peru, Bolivia, and Chile is as to the nitrate beds. Would we leave that to the nations in Europe, all of which are eager to get control of those nitrate beds? Would we allow Europe to interfere? The whole scheme of compulsory intervention will fail as voluntary arbitration has failed at The Hague because of the difficulty of agreeing upon judges.

Now, as to disarmament. There is a provision that no State should maintain more than its quota of troops or ships. That accurately expresses the idea of disarmament. It never had to be enforced in this country because no State tried to have an army or navy. It is different abroad. Germany always has wanted an army, and the world had an experience there. In the time of Napoleon it was provided that Prussia should keep under arms only 42,000 men, and Stein and other German ministers arranged a system of short enlistments and short intensive service like what we have given our officers, and they turned out

when the war again broke out against Napoleon with over 500,000 thoroughly trained men in the field. A provision for disarmament acts in favor of Germany, the country that expects to use her soldiers at home. It acts against a country like our own, where we have no military system, and have to take men 3,000 miles. A provision for an enrolled and disciplined militia would be necessary for us. We should do little with it, but it would cover a whole German army. There can be no safety in any equality of provision for a power that has the advantage of a central position, and with its soldiers always at the place where troubles are to be expected, while others must send soldiers from afar, and America and England from overseas.

The provision that we had in the league that no State shall keep a navy is vital. It would be dangerous now to the world. The navies of England and America now secure the safety of the world. They must be strong enough to secure that result.

The scheme of the confederation was for a general army and navy sufficient for the common defense. The same scheme is now called in the proposition in the paper this morning "An international police." The confederation failed to get any such army or navy. During the Revolution Congress was only able to get out at the highest about one-tenth of our able-bodied men, while in the Civil War the North got out one-fifth of its able-bodied population and the South got a much larger proportion.

Under the confederation, calls for quotas failed, requisitions for men and money failed, and the men we had were unpaid. The league could not enforce these quotas of men and money, even in our dire necessity, and the only remedy of Congress would have been to make war upon the delinquent States. This was actually proposed by Madison. Six weeks after the ratification of the articles in 1781 he proposed an amendment to give the United States full authority to employ their forces as well by sea as by land to compel any delinquent State to fulfillment of its Federal engagements. Washington approved of this, saying that a knowledge that this power was lodged in Congress might prevent its ever being exercised. Indeed, said Washington, if Congress were unquestionably possessed of the power nothing could induce the display of it but absolute disobedience and urgency of the general welfare. Madison argued that in the very nature of the confederation such a right of coercion was necessarily implied, though not expressed in the articles. Fiske declares that much might be said in behalf of this opinion. "The confederation asserted itself to be perpetual, but how could it have perpetuated itself for a dozen years without the right to coerce its members? Practically, however, the remedy was one which never could have been applied without breaking the confederation into fragments. To use the Army or Navy in coercing a State meant civil war. The local yeomanry would have turned out against the Continental Army with as high a spirit as that in which they swarmed against the enemy at Lexington and Kings Mountain. A government which could not collect the taxes for its yearly budget without firing upon its citizens or blockading harbors would have been the absurdest anomaly imaginable." (Fiske, "The Critical Period of the Revolution," p. 118.)

Afterwards, when we came to the constitutional convention, there were two plans, one for a government and the other for strengthening the power of the league. The latter, the New Jersey plan, set forth in the Paterson resolutions, aimed at a like right for the league to enforce contributions of money and men. Congress was to have power to collect taxes in the States if requisitions were not complied with. The resolutions changed the proportion of the quotas from property to men, because Congress had never been able to have a valuation of property. But in the last resolution it was proposed that the acts of the United States in Congress should be the supreme law, and that the judiciary of the States should be bound thereby, and that if any State or any body of men in any State shall oppose or prevent the carrying into execution such acts or treaties, the Federal Executive shall be authorized to call for the power of the confederated States, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to enforce and compel obedience to such acts and the observance of such treaties. Madison Debates, Volume I, pages 164 and 166, say:

3. *Resolved*, That whenever requisitions shall be necessary, instead of the rule for making requisitions mentioned in the Articles of Confederation, the United States in Congress be authorized to make such requisitions in proportion to the whole number of white and other free citizens and inhabitants, of every age, sex, and condition, including those bound to servitude for a term of years, and three-fifths of all other persons not comprehended in the foregoing description, except Indians not paying taxes; that if such requisitions be not complied with in the time specified therein to direct the collection thereof in the noncomplying States; and for that purpose to devise and pass acts directing and authorizing the same: *Provided*, That none of the powers hereby vested in the United States and Congress shall be exercised without the consent of at least — States; and in that proportion if the number of confederated States should hereafter be increased or diminished.

6. *Resolved*, That all acts of the United States in Congress, made by virtue and in pursuance of the powers hereby, and by the Articles of Confederation vested in them, and all treaties made and ratified under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the respective States, so far forth as those acts or treaties shall relate to the said States or their citizens; and that the judiciary of the several States shall be bound thereby in their decisions, anything in the respective laws of the individual States to the contrary notwithstanding; and that if any State or any body of men in any State shall oppose or prevent the carrying into execution of such acts or treaties the Federal Executive shall be authorized to call forth the power of the confederated States, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to enforce and compel an obedience to such acts, or an observance of such treaties.

Is the world league to make war on poor Poland if it fail to pay its quota of expenses? This would be tyranny, not government.

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman has been pointing out the weakness of the Articles of Confederation—how they failed to secure the necessary unity. I want to ask the gentleman this, however: Does he believe that the final union of the States in the form that we now have it could have been accomplished immediately upon the completion of the Revolution without the intervening experiment of a confederation?

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. No; I do not; and I will ask the gentleman in reply, does he want to have a union of all the people of the world, no matter how dissimilar?

Mr. BORLAND. I am not prepared to commit myself to such a union of all the people of the world.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Neither am I; and I will say that it can not be done.

Mr. BORLAND. I regard it as entirely experimental; but does not the gentleman realize that the Articles of Confederation were good for the experimental stage of American Government and that we progressed from that to a more perfect union?

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I think we had a right to try experiments with our sister States who had been with us in the Revolution. I do not think we have a right to try experiments with the Bolsheviks of Russia or with the other people over there to see whether we can make a union with them.

Mr. BORLAND. That is exactly what I wanted to ask the gentleman. Does he not think it would be wiser for us to try the experiment to get a league rather than to go to the full extent, logically, as he makes it, of having legislative, executive, and judicial power?

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. No; I would never go to that extent. It is not logical at all. The statement I have made is very clear, I believe. We need a temporary understanding. I like that word better than an alliance. We need a temporary understanding with the people who have fought with us in the war, and we will secure peace on proper terms. I do not want to go further than that.

Mr. BORLAND. But the understanding to expire when the peace is secured?

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Yes; except so far as we choose to go ahead. We carried on this war to a successful conclusion without anything in the way of writing to bind us to do it, because we thought it was for the good of the world. We can see that peace is obtained in the same way, by a similar understanding, and I hope, thank Heaven, we can do it without breaking Washington's orders and without entering into any permanent alliances.

Mr. BORLAND. It may be that these terms of peace are going to extend some years into the future and to require a great many affirmative acts to be performed by the central powers. Does not the gentleman think a close alliance with our allies is going to be necessary possibly for years to come?

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. No; I do not. I think we should be able to put pledges in the hands of the allied powers in Europe and be able to secure their ends in that regard. I think we want to get out of Europe as soon as we possibly can.

Mr. BORLAND. With reference to this idea of using force against members of the league, the great powers, of course, could put down the little ones.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Imagine the jealousy of the great powers if that were done. Imagine the jealousy if they had more than one vote, as suggested in the Marburg plan. Alexander Hamilton, in the debate on the Paterson amendment, made some remarks, and I ask to be allowed to put in an extract and to extend my remarks in the RECORD generally.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey that he extend his remarks? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. At that time Shays' rebellion was going on in Massachusetts and Alexander Hamilton spoke on the proposition to use force to maintain the Government.

He said that military force exercised on the States means war; and continued, as to the weakness of all leagues (Madison Debates, Vol. I, p. 178):

Force, by which may be understood a coercion of laws or coercion of arms. Congress has not the former, except in few cases. In particular States this coercion is nearly sufficient, though he held it, in most cases, not entirely so. A certain portion of military force is absolutely necessary in large communities. Massachusetts is now feeling this necessity and making provisions for it, but how can this force be exerted on the States collectively? It is possible. It amounts to a war between the two parties. Foreign powers also will not be idle spectators. They will interpose, the confusion will increase, and a dissolution of the Union will ensue.

Influence: He did not mean corruption, but a dispensation of those regular honors and emoluments which produce an attachment to the Government. Almost all the weight of these is on the side of the States, and must continue so as long as the States continue to exist. All the passions, then, we see, of avarice, ambition, interest, which govern most individuals and all public bodies, fall into the current of the States and do not flow into the stream of the General Government. The former, therefore, will generally be an overmatch for the General Government and render any confederacy in its very nature precarious. Theory is in this case fully confirmed by experience. The amphictyonic council had, it would seem, ample powers for general purposes. It had in particular the power of fining and using force against delinquent members. What was the consequence? Their decrees were mere signals of war. The Phocian war is a striking example of it. Philip, at length, taking advantage of their disunion and insinuating himself into their councils, made himself master of their fortunes. The German confederacy affords another lesson. The authority of Charlemagne seemed to be as great as could be necessary. The great feudal chiefs, however, exercising their local sovereignties, soon felt the spirit and found the means of encroachments, which reduced the imperial authority to a nominal sovereignty. The diet has succeeded, which, though aided by a prince at its head, of great authority independently of his imperial attributes, is a striking illustration of the weakness of confederated governments. Other examples instruct us in the same truth. The Swiss Cantons have scarce any union at all and have been more than once at war with one another.

We learn from those debates how hard it is to have anything like united action in a confederacy, even of people of the same blood like the Germans or the Swiss or ourselves, and how impossible it would be among scattered nations and peoples like those who are talked of for a world's league. Do we know anything about Russia? Do we know anything about the Balkans? Can any of us tell the difference between the governmental principles of the Serbians and Bulgarians? Does anyone know now exactly what government would suit the Armenians, who have been massacred for generations and never had any government at all? Can anyone tell me why the little Czar, regarded almost as a god by his people, was after a few months taken to prison and massacred? Can anyone tell us what became of the influence of the great Russian Church, which was supposed to govern the Russian people? Do we know what they will do from day to day? Do we know whether their representatives here really represent the Russian people or not? If we made all the leagues in the world, would we know whether the delegates to the convention represented the people or not? We are face to face with a strange emergency, in which we have to change the map of Europe, fit together what we consider the separate nations according to their language and supposed autonomous desires, and finally establish governments which will be recognized by the great powers of Europe and protected by them. In all this the allied forces must see and make sure that there is no power like Germany that shall disintegrate this scheme or add to the confusion which now exists. The United States can go no further. We ought not to try to decide details in Europe, because we know nothing about them.

The present propaganda for a "league of nations" all involve the proposition that the league shall intervene with its international forces in every dispute in Europe, Asia, Africa, or America in order to compel peace, and shall have power to make its member States contribute men and money to such forces and abide by the decisions of the league council and courts.

American soldiers abroad would cost more than those on the spot. America would fulfill her engagements at any cost, though she would not want to make war in the Balkans or in Russia, because they did not contribute to the cost of the world league or obey its mandates.

If this agreement be constitutional, it may be questioned whether it be sensible to obey a league of nations in our foreign policy and be their cat's-paw.

The great nations can be trusted. They have been for peace, with the sole exception of this military monster of modern times. They have prevented war when they could.

Egypt, India, and Morocco have obtained peace and prosperity under the control of England and France, and their people now acknowledge it with almost exaggerated loyalty. The great nations have more power than they used to have, and they likewise bear the white man's burden.

Now, there is one other thing which we learn from our American league called a confederation, and that is that it was in-

trinsically a sham—intrinsically. The Congress had to try to be President, legislature, and judge all at once, and they did nothing well. Washington had to enforce upon them his right to be Commander in Chief, and no one but Washington could have done so. They only learned that he had that right after years of warfare, just as the modern entente have learned by constant disasters that they had to have one man, Marshal Foch, at the head of the Army if they would not fail. The league and its Congress were always impotent. Any congress of nations under such a league always will be powerless against any united nation.

The American Confederation was a sham as a legislature also. The delegates, being mere delegates, consulted the welfare of their individual States and not the common good. In order to prevent hasty action by the union of the small States against large ones, it was required that a majority of two-thirds of all the States should vote in favor of any proposition, and the result was that a minority of five States was always easily found to defeat any important action. What is more, the mere absence of a few States would defeat action, and for the last three years of the Confederation there were seldom more than 20 delegates present representing seven States, barely enough to pass routine business and not enough to determine any important thing where nine was required. The great men of the country did not go to Congress. They found that business could not be transacted. Would not this be likely in any modern league? Think of the power that would be given, as some one said, to Liberia, or let us say to the hosts of Balkan and South American, Asiatic, and other States. They could unite to make us enter into their broils or to keep us from united action because they did not want to pay the expenses.

There is no plan that can be just between people of different interests that binds them to a majority or two-thirds vote. No plan is safe at all, because with interests drawn in different directions you can not have that harmony that exists here because we are one people.

Now, we must agree on peace terms that will make for peace. But they are not the terms of this league. Constantinople, for instance, must be held under the grasp of the allied powers so as to protect Russia and the East, and there is no other way to do this. Perhaps the same thing will have to be done to the Kiel Canal to give access to the Baltic and protect northern Russia. As for the payment of indemnity to the ruined countries, the German Navy and Rhine lands will have to be kept as a pledge until Germany really surrenders and pays here indemnity. Some of us think that in addition the surrender of her troops will be necessary as a pledge against war.

The United States must preserve and maintain stores of arms and munitions and a corps of officers that will enable us to arm our citizens in case of need and not have to wait three years for lack of arms and officers. Every schoolboy should learn obedience and marksmanship under well-trained officers in civil life, who would likewise make our militia a reality. Such preparedness by ourselves would be the best guaranty that no military power would again disturb the peace of the world.

I read again from Washington's Farewell Address:

It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliance with any portion of the foreign world;

Taking care always to keep ourselves by suitable establishments on a respectable defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Yes.

Mr. SLOAN. What other nation outside of the United States is talking seriously about a league of nations?

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I know none.

Mr. SLOAN. Who outside of a few officers and a few individuals throughout the United States is claiming that we can establish a practical, well-working league of nations?

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I do not know who the parties are that provide the means for broadside advertisements of a whole page in newspapers and issue all kinds of books and articles at great expense. They have some of the best names in the whole country in their societies. At one time a general league of nations was favored immediately, but Mr. Taft, our former President, now wants a small alliance of the great powers. He and others seem to think that the alliance of great States should look to a future general league for general peace, which, perhaps, if they attempt it, will only embroil us in every foreign dissension.

Mr. SLOAN. Have they formulated a correct basis for one of these leagues except that which is a good deal of a nebulous discussion?

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Yes; I have two or three little books or circulars that give formative plans. One is by Mr. Everett P. Wheeler.

Mr. SLOAN. Who is Mr. Wheeler?

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. He is a very strong lawyer and a very good man.

Mr. SLOAN. What is his record? Has he had any experience in handling national affairs?

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. He is a very good lawyer and a very sensible man. I do not know that experience makes us any better when we come to get at new things. One other has spoken, and that is the President of the United States. His proposition is clear as to that. There is no sort of doubt about it.

Mr. SLOAN. I was asking outside of officials.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I was not including him as an official. He is President of the United States.

I fear this proposed general league. I fear that it may tie us up so much that these effete governments and new governments will make confusion worse confounded. I fear for the independence of the United States of America.

America has had her experience with leagues. We turned from that league, or confederation, to what Washington glorified in his Farewell Address. He found the completion of his work in the new birth of our Nation. He tells us that the love of liberty is but the beginning, and that the end is the Union, the State, the Constitution that our own hands had framed, giving to the people a government that mere allegiance could never give, realizing the name of American, which he says belongs to us in our national capacity, and "must always exalt the just pride of patriotism more than any appellation derived from local discriminations," as embodying our common struggles, battles, triumphs, dangers, sufferings, and success. He tells us that sentiment and interest alike bind us together—North, South, East, and West—and that union alone can support liberty. He exhorts us to look to that union as our "palladium of safety and prosperity," to speak and think of it with constant affection, to discourage amendment lest that should breed the spirit of change, to let the Constitution grow as all government must grow—from within—and so to work out the destiny of one Nation, whose Constitution, once adopted by the people, is "sacredly obligatory upon all" and can be changed only "by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people."

His courage calls it a crime to doubt the continuance of the Nation. He tells us that amid such prospects and such dangers as surround us the union is worth the trial. He tells us to be prepared for war, to deal fairly with all other nations, but to avoid hatred or fondness for any, and especially to guard against any passionate attachment for any one nation, and to steer clear of permanent alliances or even a permanent commercial policy with any nation of the world.

In the earnestness of the retiring chief we read an anxiety which only history can explain. Only two years after the Constitution had been adopted he had seen the French Revolution, with its constitutions of a day or of a year, the carnage of party strife, and the sudden destruction of the property, credit, and institutions of that nation. That revolution was still in the height of its power. Our chief says nothing of all this, but it is plainly in his thought, and he urges on his children reverence for law, union, peace, fear of party spirit, economy, religion, hatred of change, and strict maintenance of the public credit. Clearly he was thinking of the wild doctrines of the rights of man as an individual without regard to the rights of society, which characterized the French Revolution and are still a potent force even in the modern world.

I wrote this some years ago. Such a revolution as the French Revolution is going on now, certainly in Russia and possibly in other nations. It must work itself out in each case upon the spot. Each nation must learn for itself to govern itself. No others, certainly not we, can teach them how. No alliance could or should control what the President calls the autonomy of each people and their autonomous desires.

Mr. SLOAN. One other question, if you please.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. In just one minute.

America will intervene whenever it is necessary to save the world from robber conquest. But until that danger again arises America will mind her own business and keep her hands off while she holds up the light of liberty that will enlighten the earth after the allied armies have established a fair and business government in the various territories. [Applause.]

Mr. SLOAN. I am very much interested in the very able speech, but I did not hear all of it. I would like to know whether the gentleman attempts in any wise to square this talk for a league of nations with the Farewell Address of our first President?

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. It can not be squared.

Mr. SLOAN. And you feel safer in following the address of George Washington than you do the distinguished passenger on the *George Washington*, do you?

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I am not making a comparison, sir. [Applause.]

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman; the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson], in charge of the bill, wishes that 30 minutes' recognition be given to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, one of the imperative problems to be solved as a part of the reconstruction legislation of this war will be the creation of a budget system for the United States. This country, strange to say, has had nothing approaching a budget system, but the business interests of the country are now beginning to discuss with a very deep-seated earnestness the necessity for such a system. It may clarify the problem somewhat, and possibly lead to its solution, if we get some idea of what is meant by a budget system. To my mind a budget system means simply the two sides of the public ledger. It means that the Federal Government should gauge its expenditures by its income, or possibly, stated from the opposite angle, that it should provide its income in proportion to its necessary expenses, and that there should appear upon the open pages of the public ledger the exact statement of the governmental expense on the one side, balanced on the other by an exact statement of the sources of revenue out of which those expenses are to be paid.

This system is so simple and is so fundamental in all business enterprises, and its need is so clear to every man who has had the most elementary experience in business affairs, that it seems a matter of the greatest surprise that nothing of the kind has ever occurred in regard to our Federal expenditures.

One reason for this has been that we have subsisted during our national life very largely upon a system of indirect taxation, raised from tariff duties and internal revenue, under which system it is absolutely impossible to tell what the national income is to be. Hence the expenditures could not be regulated in accordance with the income. In fact, we had as many surpluses in our Federal Treasury under that system as we had deficits. Now we have come to an era of direct taxation, in which the backbone of the fiscal system of this Government must be the income tax. Every man will see reflected in his annual tax bill the burdens of the Federal Government, and there will be no opportunity to camouflage or to juggle or to say that taxes are not borne by the citizen. There will be no opportunity to pretend that the foreigner pays the tax. There will be no chance to say that taxes are not a public burden, but in some mysterious way are the source of prosperity to the Nation. Once we eliminate that idea from the public mind there will be no difficulty in getting down to a system of a budget.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. BORLAND. Certainly.

Mr. STEVENSON. How much nearer will there be certainty as to the Government's income when based upon income tax that has not already been earned than there is on the income which is based on the revenue derived from a tariff tax, which depends upon the amount of imports? I would like to find out where the greater certainty comes in.

Mr. BORLAND. There is a great deal more certainty. I am glad the gentleman asked that question. Tariff taxes are based upon the imports that chance to come in during a fiscal year. The imports are dependent upon world conditions of trade, which are absolutely out of the control of the country levying the tariff duty and which are impossible to foresee. We can only estimate them by what has occurred in the past, and we have never succeeded yet in hitting the amount even approximately. But an income tax is based upon the current income of persons and of corporations in the United States, whose volume of business for the current year is absolutely a matter of record. There is a certain margin according to which we can estimate the increase of business. We can not, of course, foresee any extraordinary matters that might increase or diminish these revenues, but we can hit approximately the revenues, and, as a matter of fact, our experience under an income tax shows that we are able approximately to estimate them.

Mr. STEVENSON. But does not income also depend largely upon the condition of business in the country, and does it not vary very largely? And when we make appropriations here in the early part of the year, based on the income that citizens are going to have that year, are we able to foretell what the conditions are going to be and what amount we are going to get?

Mr. BORLAND. We are better able to tell what the business is to be than what the tariff will produce. A man running a street car company does not know exactly how many people are going to ride on his cars next year, but he has an accurate idea

of how many have ridden on them in the year before, and the prospects of an increase or a decrease, and he is able to make an accurate estimate within a few dollars of how much his fares will amount to. And exactly so as to any man's business. No merchant can tell certainly, when he puts a stock of goods on the shelves, what he will make out of that stock of goods, but nine times out of ten he can do it nearly enough to enable him to fix the prices properly. The very change of the fiscal system from the indirect to direct taxes is going to force a budget system. In my judgment that is one of two elements.

The other element is the enormous growth of the Federal expenditures. Heretofore while Federal expenditures have been comparatively little per capita in this country, little attention has been paid to them, but now they are tremendously heavy and bid fair during a course of years to be materially heavy; so materially heavy as to amount to an important factor in the earnings of every business man in the United States.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Would the gentleman care to give to the House an estimate of what he thinks our expenditures will be in the year 1920?

Mr. BORLAND. No; I am utterly unable to tell closer than was given by the leader of the majority [Mr. KITCHIN].

Mr. LONGWORTH. Does the gentleman agree with the statement of the Secretary of the Treasury that they will be about \$4,000,000,000?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes. That is my estimate. That would be approximately my estimate; at least \$4,000,000,000 in 1920.

Mr. LONGWORTH. At least?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes; I say "at least" because I do not think that is an overstatement at all.

Mr. FOCHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. FOCHT. Does the gentleman take into account any interest to be paid by the foreign countries who have secured these loans from the United States? Have you deducted that?

Mr. BORLAND. No. I do not think between now and 1920 we will collect a dollar of interest from any foreign country. On the contrary, I am quite convinced that we will continue to advance them money.

Mr. FOCHT. Under this theory, would you make provision for any payment of the public debt whatever?

Mr. BORLAND. No. That does not, in my judgment, embrace a sinking fund. That embraces the interest upon our accrued indebtedness and the cost of the upkeep of our present activities.

Mr. FOCHT. Under this budget system you would undertake to relieve the House and the country from all these difficulties that we have had with deficiency bills? We will have no more deficiency bills? Is that the idea?

Mr. BORLAND. That is a new idea, but possibly that is true.

Mr. FOCHT. Furthermore, do I understand you to absolutely abandon the old traditional policy of your party of a tariff for revenue only? [Laughter.]

Mr. BORLAND. If that is so traditional, then I abandon it, but it is not traditional, to my mind.

Mr. FOCHT. It is not?

Mr. BORLAND. No. Up to the time that an income tax was constitutional in this country—in fact, I thought it was constitutional in 1893—but up to the time that an income tax was constitutional in this country it was absolutely essential to rely upon a tariff for revenue. But the traditional policy of the Democratic Party, if I understand it aright, has always been for an income tax as the fairest and most democratic system of raising revenue. If a tariff exists the Democrats insist that it shall be so framed as to provide revenue, and not be prohibitive in character.

When we speak of a budget we understand, impliedly, the English system. Under the English system, as I understand it, the officers of the Crown, who are responsive to and practically chosen by the popular branch of the legislature, prepare both the estimates of expenditures and the tax proposal, and present them as one concrete plan to Parliament.

Under that system, if the people do not desire a certain activity of the government, then they can be assured that it will cause a certain definite reduction in the tax bill. If they insist upon a certain activity—for instance, old-age pensions—then they are confronted with the plain necessity of providing by a tax for the money necessary for that activity. If they do not want the activity, they can get along without the tax. If they want the activity, they must have the tax. They can balance the one against the other. As I understand it, the English Government must stand or fall upon its budget. It

goes before the country with its budget, which includes everything from the largest question of foreign policy and national defense down to the smallest road or bridge in the kingdom. The ministry, or the Government, as it is called, stands or falls upon the success of that budget in passing Parliament.

There is one particular feature about that system which does not prevail here. There the executive is absolutely the creature of the legislative branch. If the program of the executive is not accepted, it means political death, and a ministry must be formed which will command a proper majority in Parliament. In our Government we have an Executive chosen for a fixed term, who may lose the command of the legislative branch of the Government without being legislated out of office. It is not difficult to see why every civilized nation which has adopted parliamentary government has adopted the English system. There is no Government, outside of some unsuccessful Republics to the south of us, that has attempted to fix the tenure of executive power. The executive power in all parliamentary governments resides in a ministry responsive directly to the representatives of the people.

Under our system of government we not only have no budget system but our system is so chaotic that it is almost impossible to describe it in a few words or even in many. Under the theory of our Constitution Congress has the sole power of raising revenue and appropriating money. It has no control over the Executive; it has no control over the advisers of the Executive, who are the heads of the departments. After the Cabinet officers are once confirmed by the Senate their term of office is practically fixed. But, theoretically, Congress has absolute control over the public purse. It can raise such money as it sees fit and provide by law for the expenditure of the funds in such manner as it deems wise. The Executive is supposed to carry out those instructions. In practice that is not possible. As a matter of fact, the Executive must furnish the basis of the information upon which the appropriations are made. Under our practice that basis is the estimates. Those estimates are prepared annually by the chiefs of the bureaus and the heads of the departments. There is no correlation between them. There is no limit to them except the expansive force of the imagination of an ambitious politician who happens to be at the head of a particular bureau. Any executive officer can estimate for all kinds of activities that he thinks he would like to engage in and which might enlarge the importance of his particular work. Some of them might be good. All might be good. But there is nothing to indicate their relative value or importance. Those estimates go to the Secretary of the Treasury and as a purely clerical matter are put in the form of a compilation and are sent to Congress. Here they are distributed in fragments. A fragment is thrown to one committee and another fragment to another committee, according to the division of jurisdiction fixed by the rules of the House of Representatives. The appropriation bills are made up in those several committees absolutely without relation to the relative importance of any of the particular estimates.

It is true that there are men on all of these committees who by length of service and experience are familiar with the history of certain appropriations. It is true also that in the hearings had upon the question of granting a new appropriation it is possible in some way to have an accounting as to what was done with the previous appropriation for the same or similar purposes. But even if it were possible to have accurate information of the expenditure of previous appropriations Congress is perfectly powerless after it has got the information. In but few cases can it refuse a new appropriation for a meritorious purpose on account of the misappropriation or unwise use of a previous appropriation. It has not, except in the grossest cases of criminality, any possible control over the officer who may have been guilty of the unwise or unlawful use of the money. It can not control, except by legislative limitation, the use of the new funds. My experience is that the power of Congress to control by limitation the use of money in the hands of the executive is the feeblest power on earth. It is a power that any smart man can evade. It is a power that ties the hands only of the efficient. It is a power that adds to the delay and red tape and expense of government. It is impossible for Congress, under the form of limitation, to compel efficiency in the executive departments. We must rely upon the centralized responsibility of the executive departments themselves.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Is not Congress under this additional disadvantage as compared with the House of Commons, that there, as I understand it, no public bill appropriating money can even be introduced in the House of Commons except through the ministry, whereas here any Member of Congress can offer any number of bills appropriating any number of millions?

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman is entirely right.

Mr. FOCHT. That applies not only to appropriation bills, but it is well known that a member of Parliament has no right or option with relation to introducing any legislation. All legislation there is controlled by the ministry, which means the Crown.

Mr. BORLAND. Oh, no; it does not mean the Crown.

Mr. ELSTON. The gentleman has made the point that there is no limitation on the amount of the appropriation bills that may be introduced in Congress, and that therefore a great flood of such bills can accumulate in the office of the President of the United States. Now, is it not true in every State of the Union that the governor of that State generally has before him appropriations amounting to probably five times the amount that the State taxation would bear according to the ruling rate, and does not every governor have to be a sort of a budget committee of his own, and prune the appropriations down to what the people will stand?

Mr. BORLAND. Undoubtedly that is in a measure true.

Mr. ELSTON. Now, why can not the President of the United States organize an advisory committee to supervise the bills that come to him, and exercise the right of veto, and in that way, to some extent, take the place of the budget system?

Mr. BORLAND. That has been suggested, I will say to the gentleman from California—that the President of the United States be given the right to veto specific items in appropriation bills. The gentleman from California realizes what an enormous burden that would be, even if the President did it only in the counsels of his own office; but if we were to turn loose on him all the people interested for and against a particular item it would be a very much larger burden. I do not think that is the real remedy. I know it is a remedy used in a great many States, and possibly it works in a satisfactory way.

Mr. ELSTON. I spoke of that as a mediating factor and not as a solution of the proposition.

Mr. STEVENSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. STEVENSON. That question of vetoing the specific items in an appropriation bill would involve calling the roll of the House on each item.

Mr. BORLAND. It might.

Mr. STEVENSON. In the State of South Carolina I have seen the governor veto 160 items in one appropriation bill, and it took four days to call the roll on a sufficient number of items to pass them over his vote, and they passed every one of them.

Mr. BORLAND. To resume my discussion, I say that not only are there a dozen committees with power to frame appropriation bills, but there are a number of committees that prepare and bring in bills that provide a charge on the Public Treasury which must afterwards be met by appropriations from the public funds.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. MCKENZIE. I think I got a wrong conception of the meaning of the gentleman. Does he desire us to understand that the members of Parliament can not add an amendment to a supply bill or an appropriation bill?

Mr. BORLAND. I am going to convey that idea now, although I have not reached that point. It is a fact.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Does the gentleman contend that we ought to have such a budget system that the Congress of the United States would not have the power to add to or take from an appropriation bill?

Mr. BORLAND. I am going to contend that Congress does not need the power to add to the estimates of the executive.

Mr. FOCHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. FOCHT. I am sure the gentleman is going to include this thought, just where he is going to lodge any power or authority or discretion or option in respect to limitation of appropriations, who is to have it, and how are they to exercise it?

Mr. BORLAND. A budget system implies necessarily a centralized responsibility of the executive. It abolishes the twilight zone by which the executive and Congress both escape the ultimate responsibility of increase of governmental expenses. If there has been any failure, in my judgment it has been perfectly plain that it has been the failure on the part of Congress to control the efficiency of the executive departments. That seems to be absolutely impossible under our system. We must look the budget system squarely in the face if we are to discuss it, and under such a system it is essential that the executive be permitted to control all estimates and expenditures and all proposals of taxes, and that they balance one another, so that the program can be presented as a whole upon the responsibility of the executive. That necessarily takes away from the legislative the power to add to that program. It does not take away

from the legislative the power to veto any or all the items of the program, but it does necessarily take away from the legislative the power to initiate appropriations.

What does the legislative department really lose by the loss of that power? All of us know that, as a matter of fact, the charge that Members of Congress have an undue appetite for pork is largely a matter of newspaper persiflage. The truth about the matter is that the real appetite for pork is back in the constituency. I have rarely seen the man elected to this House from any constituency, urban or rural, that did not come here the first day of his term pledged to make some kind of a raid on the Federal Treasury. I do not recall an exception to that rule. If a man wants to run for Congress anywhere in the United States, the first thing he does is to think up something he can ask the Federal Government to spend in that district and go out and campaign on that issue. If he wants to run against the sitting Member, the first charge he makes against him is that he did not bring home the bacon to that district, and he, the new aspirant, pledges himself to do better in that line than the man he hopes to succeed, who probably had a fine record himself as a pork hunter.

Mr. STEVENSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. For a short question.

Mr. STEVENSON. If the budget can not be added to by Congress and is originated by the executive, have you not shifted the constitutional right to originate revenue and appropriate legislation in the House?

Mr. BORLAND. The Constitution says that no money shall be withdrawn from the Federal Treasury except by appropriations made in accordance with law. We are not shifting that right at all. The Constitution also says that bills that raise revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives. Of course the House of Representatives would have to adhere in a large measure to the whole program presented by the executive.

Now, what have we lost? We have lost, in my judgment, very little in losing the power to add items of appropriation on the floor, but we have gained much in the centralization of responsibility on the executive. This brings me to a point of very much more importance, in my judgment, and one that we ought to face fearlessly. If the executive has the sole power of laying out the program of revenue, the sole power of estimating for appropriations, and the sole responsibility of expenditure, as it does in fact now, then the legislative ought to reserve to itself the power of vetoing the program of the executive and ought to have the courage to veto it, if the plan does not commend itself to the popular judgment.

Men talk about the risk of starving the executive by withholding supply bills. Why, the whole history of free government rests on the power of the people to starve the Government until the policy of the executive conforms to the will of the people. Unless the people and their representatives have both the will and the courage to starve the executive until it complies with the popular will, then the lesson of parliamentary government has been learned in vain. If a plan be presented by an executive with a fixed tenure which does not meet the approval of the majority of the legislative body, it would be absolutely the right and the high moral duty of the legislative body to say so. Then the issue would be clearly presented to the people as to whether the legislature or the executive were right on that program.

Mr. FOCHT. The gentleman has answered the question I desired to ask as to where he would lodge the power. I understand it would be with the President?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. FOCHT. Is that the gentleman's judgment? Is that the common idea of those who favor the budget system, that the President should have this control?

Mr. BORLAND. I can not speak for others, and only for myself, and am only giving a few fragmentary views of my own.

Mr. FOCHT. I would also ask if the President of the United States had control of these vast appropriations, whether he means he should allow them to follow it up by having a tenure limited to one term or whether he would expect him to stay here for life, with all this money to spend?

Mr. BORLAND. I am speaking about our system, where the Executive has a fixed tenure of power. We can not throw the Executive out of office by failure to pass supply bills. I am saying Congress still reserves the right, by failure to give him the necessary money, to control the policy of the Executive if it has the courage to exercise it.

Mr. FOCHT. I want to ask: The gentleman is differentiating between the policy and system of government that we have and that in England, and seems to be exalting theirs and deprecating ours. Is it not possible the forefathers who framed

this Constitution for us believed in their hearts there would be intelligence enough in the American Congress so to frame the laws as still to retain the power given to the people instead of delegating it all to one man? What is the gentleman's answer to that?

Mr. BORLAND. I will answer it.

Mr. FOCHT. If the gentleman pleases.

Mr. BORLAND. I will answer it in this way: At the time our Federal Government was formed in 1787 a budget system was not known in England or anywhere else on earth. Our Government is the oldest government in the world—

Mr. FOCHT. Of its kind.

Mr. BORLAND. Without exception. The English Government in its present form dates from 1830. The reform bill which gave control to the House of Commons rather than to the House of Lords and the whole budget system of England dates from that time. The other parliamentary governments are the same way.

Mr. MAPES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. I will.

Mr. MAPES. Does the gentleman think, to carry out his idea of a budget system, it will be necessary to amend the Constitution of the United States?

Mr. BORLAND. No; and I will discuss that in a minute. There is one other thing I want to add at this point. Now, gentlemen, besides centralizing on the executive the absolute responsibility for all items of appropriation we retain to Congress the right to reject the budget if we decide it is wrong. Then we come to the auditing—

Mr. MANN. Before the gentleman passes away from the budget system—

Mr. BORLAND. I am not passing away from it.

Mr. MANN. I thought the gentleman was going into the question of auditing. I think I can get the gentleman a little more time if necessary. I would like to say there has been a great deal of talk throughout the country about the advisability of Congress adopting what is referred to as the "budget" system. My own experience is that I have never met anyone before who knew what it was. As I understand the gentleman, if correctly, it is not what is known in other parts of the world as the budget system. The executive prepares a list of appropriations to be made, transmits that to the legislative body, which is not able to increase any item or add any new item?

Mr. BORLAND. It has power to reject any item or reduce it.

Mr. MANN. Has power to reject any item. Of course that is in all cases as now in operation in countries where they have a responsible ministry, where, of course, the ministry does not have the parliament with it it goes by the board anyhow. Now, as a matter of fact, do not we in this country come very close to a budget system now? Is it not a fact we rarely make an appropriation which is not estimated for by the Executive?

Mr. BORLAND. Very rarely.

Mr. MANN. Is it not a fact in most cases the committees on appropriation, instead of adding new items which are not estimated for, confine most of their attention to the consideration of bills for reducing items which are estimated for, or cutting out items entirely which are estimated for?

Mr. BORLAND. That is correct.

Mr. MANN. And under the existing law, is it not the duty of the executive branch of the Government in making these estimates to make what would practically be a budget?

Mr. BORLAND. It is. It is their duty to make up this compilation of estimates.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BORLAND. I shall want about 15 more minutes.

Mr. DAVIS. I will yield the gentleman 10 minutes more.

Mr. BORLAND. I thank the gentleman. I might want more time, as I desire to cover another point.

Mr. MANN. If the budget were to be made up under the so-called budget system, would it not be made up by precisely the same individuals and departments now making up the estimates?

Mr. BORLAND. No; not in that complete sense. The estimates which come in now are only a compilation—

Mr. MANN. Oh, well, the gentleman will recall that the law requires—

Mr. BORLAND. It requires it.

Mr. MANN. Well, now, if the gentleman means to say that people do not comply with the law, that is another thing. The law, as I understand, now requires all estimates shall be submitted to the President—

Mr. BORLAND. And to the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. MANN. To the Secretary and to the President, and that the President must send to Congress a recommendation, in case the estimates of appropriation exceed the estimated revenue,

how the additional revenue shall be raised. And I assume that the President will comply with those provisions of law. Now, how would it change the situation in the interest of economy to make a little more absolute the estimates now made by the departments which are constantly rejected by the committees and by Congress, in the form of a budget, giving them a little higher authority than they now have? How would that be in the interest of economy? By centralizing the responsibility? Is that the gentleman's idea?

Mr. BORLAND. That is exactly my idea. I am not at all positive, neither can any man be positive, that the change would result in economy. The appetite for "pork" might be transferred from the legislative to the executive department, and it is entirely possible that an administration might come into power conceiving the happy idea that by a proper distribution of appropriations it could maintain itself in power. That is not entirely impossible. There is no way to prevent that. But the responsibility would be clear, not confused. If the people wanted economy, they could get it, but if they wanted extravagance, they could get that. But the whole idea, as I understand, of the budget system is to centralize before public opinion both the power and the responsibility. Now, if we can accomplish that by simply waiving our right—our supposed right under the Constitution, which we rarely exercise, as the gentleman says—if we can waive that right to add to the budget and hold the executive strictly accountable for every item in the budget, we have accomplished at least that advantage of the budget system.

Mr. MANN. Well, the executive is now responsible for every item in the estimates.

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman has failed to read the American press in his usual careful way, because it is the very common and widespread opinion of the people and the press that Congress is responsible for every extravagance.

Mr. MANN. I think the press is rather demanding a budget system.

Mr. BORLAND. What the gentleman says is correct. Congress very frequently cuts down the estimates of the departments.

Mr. MANN. Take, for instance, two bills that are sometimes referred to as "pork-barrel bills"—the river and harbor bill and the public-buildings bill—and is it not a fact that every year the estimates for public buildings and rivers and harbors vastly exceed the appropriations made by Congress?

Mr. BORLAND. Always, without exception, in my experience, the approved projects coming in for rivers and harbors and approved projects coming in for public buildings from the executive departments exceed what Congress is willing to grant, and yet Congress has been constantly attacked as the author and sole beneficiary of that system.

Mr. MANN. I am not seeking to defend the bills at this time. I endeavored to read something in reference to the budget system and ascertain such facts as I could. It seems to me, and I realize that we may need to do something—it seems to me the budget system as operated in other countries is mainly designed to leave to the voting power of the legislative branch free right to O. K. something which they can not refuse to do. And that it only adds to the executive power instead of taking away from it. It seems to me, while the press of the country is rather advocating the budget system, it is doing it on the theory that it will take away the executive power and add to the legislative to keep down appropriations.

Mr. BORLAND. I am very glad to have the expressed views of the gentleman from Illinois, and I do not feel that I have either the capacity or experience to answer all of the objections that he has implied and suggested. The only thing I can say is if we talk about a budget system at all we must still look the question squarely in the face and make up our mind what we mean by the budget system. I am trying to explain what it means to me; that is, definite responsibility both for revenue and expenditures.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CANNON. If I understand aright, a budget system is submitted by the executive, generally by the ministry. The Prime Minister in England, for instance, presents it, and if it is turned down the government changes. Then there is an election, and after an election the budget system is not worth three whoops, as I understand it.

Mr. BORLAND. I covered that a moment ago.

Mr. CANNON. I was not in, and I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. BORLAND. I covered it in this way, I will say to the gentleman from Illinois: Our executive has a fixed tenure of office, but the party to which the executive belongs may lose the control of the legislative branch, without the executive

going out of office. That differentiates us from all other parliamentary Governments in the world, practically. Now, what the gentleman says is true. The failure of the budget in any parliamentary Government of the world is the death of the ministry and necessitates usually a general election. With us it would not be so, we having an executive with a fixed tenure of office. With the power in Congress to provide or withhold the supplies for carrying out the orders of the executive, it would depend then upon a pure question of political courage between the legislative and the executive. If the legislative had the courage to refuse the supplies to the executive, the executive would be compelled to present a program which would be satisfactory to the legislature. That is the only answer I can see under our Constitution.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. As a matter of fact, is not the budget system as it has been discussed rather a nebulous proposition, something like the freedom of the seas and the removal of economic barriers, and various other propositions?

Mr. BORLAND. It is a matter of taste.

There is one point I wanted to discuss further, and that is the question of audit. In my judgment, as I say, centralized responsibility for both pages of the ledger must rest with the Executive. And Congress must give up its nebulous power to add to the budget on the floor of the House—a power so rarely exercised that it is not worth contending over.

The third thing is true, that we must have a legislative control over the expenditures of funds that have once been granted. That is the thing that we do not now have. The audit which occurs now is what is known as the administrative audit. It is an audit only under control of the executive officer himself who spends the money, or rather it is under the same group of executive officers who expend the money. It is done by an auditor of the Treasury Department for the different departments of the Government. Of course there is an officer whose duty it is to pass upon the question whether a particular expenditure ought to be made out of one particular appropriation or out of another particular appropriation. His decision is more or less of a technical legal nature. Neither of these goes into the question of the wisdom, the efficiency, or the propriety of the expenditure of the money. Neither of them goes into the question whether the purpose the Congress had in mind could have been accomplished by a less expenditure of money or by an expenditure in a totally different way. In other words, the executive officers are in the habit of coming to Congress for all that they can possibly get and getting all they possibly can and then seeing to it that they spend it all, for fear that if they show an unexpended balance at the end of the fiscal year Congress may refuse further appropriations along the same line.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. BORLAND. Can the gentleman from Mississippi yield me 10 minutes more?

Mr. SISSON. Can the gentleman get along with five?

Mr. BORLAND. I would rather have 10, but I will accommodate myself to the gentleman.

Mr. SISSON. I yield to the gentleman 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 10 minutes more.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes; but I would like to have the gentleman make his question brief.

Mr. STEVENSON. I got the impression from the discussions I have heard here on the budget system that it also embraces the idea that all appropriations should be carried and handled by only one committee, instead of five or six, as they are now. Is there anything like that embraced in the gentleman's idea?

Mr. BORLAND. I do not think that is fundamental. I do think, however, it is fundamental that the legislative branch of the Government should control the audit of the expenditure of the money.

Mr. STEVENSON. I have no doubt that is a good idea.

Mr. BORLAND. I think that power to audit the expenditure of the money is more valuable than the power to add appropriations from the floor of the House. It is a notable fact, gentlemen, that under the English system the auditing committee of Parliament is in control of the party opposite to the party in power. It is never even under the control of the party in power, and it does seem to me that is one of the most wholesome features of the whole thing.

It is possible for experienced members of a committee, such as my distinguished friend from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], who was at the head of the Committee on Appropriations for years and is now a distinguished and hard-working member of it, a

man of intimate familiarity with the history of appropriations, to detect in many cases the unwise and improper expenditure of the funds, but the power of Congress when that is done is a small matter. Its power is feeble when it discovers those cases of incompetence or abuse. But it is not possible for the average Member to even discover them under the glittering generalities of the average testimony that is given in the average appropriation hearing. There must be somewhere a committee charged with the power of going through these expenditures to determine the wisdom and propriety of them, not simply to determine whether they have been honestly made. For we may correctly assume, I think, that in all parties that might be in power in our Government, in the main, our expenditures would be honest under the law. But whether they have been wisely and efficiently made is an entirely different matter, and that, after all, is the real matter of interest to the taxpayer. If the Congress can not by legislative limitation control, direct, or procure efficiency in the various departments of the Government, there is only one way, then, in which it can proceed. If it can not do so by legislation in advance, then it can certainly be done by an audit and a public record of the expenditure after it has been made.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. The gentleman means for the legislature to control the expenditure of that money?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes; to require an accounting of its expenditure.

Mr. TILSON. Would he have a committee of Congress clothed with power and authority to change the expenditure in any way? What could they do more than make a formal audit to see whether it was correct or not?

Mr. BORLAND. The audit made under this system is more of a record for the public. It is not possible to recall the expenditures. In some cases, of course, it is possible to lead to the dismissal of officials, and frequently that might also be a wholesome result; but the main purpose accomplished is exactly what is done in every business house—to find out where the money has gone and whether those charged with the executive authority in that concern have wisely used the funds of the common purse.

Mr. TILSON. Then the gentleman speaks of its being in control of the minority. The gentleman, of course, means in that case that it would be opposed to the Executive? That is, in this case it would be a party in opposition to the White House?

Mr. BORLAND. That is true.

Mr. TILSON. Rather than to the majority in Congress?

Mr. BORLAND. That is true; opposition to the Executive.

Now, gentlemen, I realize what I am saying. You gentlemen on the Republican side are coming into power in the Sixty-sixth Congress. You will have your investigating committees of the executive departments anyway. They will be hit-or-miss concerns, possibly, or they may not be. It is a great deal better, in my judgment, that they should be general in their operations and have some logical and symmetrical plan than that they be simply smelling committees, as they might easily be. It is entirely possible to dig up some one item which might have some political significance without being of any service whatever to the taxpayer. But a full and genuine accounting is a very essential thing, I think, to the taxpayers, and I think it is a very essential thing to the budget. Of course, we understand that in parliamentary governments the ministers have access to the floor of the legislative branch.

Even that is not impossible under our Constitution. All that would be required would be a simple change in the rules of this House. In my judgment it would be a very highly desirable change. I think when a matter concerning the Post Office Department was before the House it would be entirely possible to have the Postmaster General given the freedom of debate. On a matter concerning the issuance of liberty bonds and the expenses of floating the loan it would be entirely possible to have the Secretary of the Treasury here to explain the matter. If it concerned an expenditure for agricultural purposes, it would be entirely possible and very much better to have the Secretary of Agriculture here to give us some definite knowledge of his plans. We are always told from some source what the executive wants, but it would be very much better to have the right to cross-examine the executive himself and ask him why he wants that rather than some other possible plan.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. Admitting that there would be certain advantages in having Cabinet officers appear and defend the items

in their bills, would not the inevitable result be that the men on the committee, who now feel the responsibility of investigation, because they have to defend the items on the floor, would feel no further responsibility, and that no one in the House would know anything about any appropriations?

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman is suggesting a possible difficulty there. The members of the committee do undertake to post themselves as to these questions which they think are going to arise and endeavor to give information to their fellow Members of the House. Sometimes they are able to do it. Sometimes, of course, they are unable to do it.

Mr. MANN. Of course, no one knows enough to know everything that can come up on an appropriation bill, but the man in charge of an appropriation bill on the floor of this House who comes in once without knowing his bill very thoroughly, never feels anxious to come before the House again under the same disadvantage.

Mr. BORLAND. Suppose the question to be one of personal responsibility for a policy. The members of the committee are not personally responsible for the policy of the member of the Cabinet. They give all the information that is available, but they are not responsible. Suppose Congress wants to know why a certain policy was adopted by a certain member of the Cabinet, as it has a right, in framing this legislation or granting its appropriations, to be satisfied on that point. Is it not very much better to get that information at first hand from the man who is responsible?

Mr. MANN. Do we not get it at first hand?

Mr. BORLAND. I do not know.

Mr. MANN. Is not the Cabinet officer or the subordinate under him asked those very identical questions in the committee during the hearings? And those hearings are printed so that all members have an opportunity to see them in cold print. Is not that a great deal more effective than it would be for some Cabinet officer to rise here, who would not know anything about the details of the subject, without having four or five or a dozen subordinates to coach him and give him the information on something that he is not posted on?

Mr. BORLAND. I think not.

Mr. MANN. I am not indicating my own attitude on the subject.

Mr. BORLAND. I know that, of course. The Cabinet officer may not be thoroughly posted. It is impossible for the chairman of the committee to be thoroughly posted, and the Cabinet officer may not be.

Mr. MANN. I am not reflecting on anybody.

Mr. BORLAND. It is not possible for a Cabinet officer to know all the questions of detail, but he would know the general questions of policy. I heard it suggested by a distinguished Member of this House that one effect of the rule permitting Cabinet officers to appear on the floor and be subjected to the interrogation of Members of the House would be the shattering of a number of large-sized political reputations. I am not sure about that. But whatever might be the result, I think it would be wholesome.

Mr. KINKAID. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. KINKAID. As a practical proposition, does not the gentleman believe that the committee would become better informed by having a Cabinet officer or his representatives, who are better informed than the Cabinet officer himself, probably—or take several of them together, their combined information would be more effective, perhaps, than that of the Cabinet officer—to have those assistants of the Cabinet officer come once or twice or three times or more before the committee, and thus ground the committee thoroughly by examining and cross-examining, and then that well-grounded, well-advised committee come before the House and inform the House thoroughly and answer all questions? Would not that be better, as a practical proposition?

Mr. BORLAND. No; I think not. I am sorry to say I would not agree to that. I think that if the Cabinet officer could not answer the questions in detail he would do exactly as he does now. He would say, "I will file that report later"; but I think upon the broad questions of his policy he could and should be able to answer all questions. [Applause.]

Mr. Sisson. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LAZARO].

Mr. LAZARO. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, last week when the bill for a sanatorium for the treatment of tubercular patients was up for consideration we were told that the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds were preparing a measure that would take care of all the men who had contracted tuberculosis in the service. I take it that every Member of this House, Democrat or Republican, feels that some-

thing ought to be done for the care of the men who have contracted tuberculosis in the service.

Now, I want to make a few suggestions for your consideration. First of all, if you are going to do anything for these tubercular patients it must be done right away, because any medical man will tell you that unless tuberculosis is treated in its beginning there is very little chance of effecting a cure. Second, I think we ought to find out as soon as possible the number of men who have contracted tuberculosis in the service. Third, I think we ought to appropriate a sum large enough to take care of all those men. Fourth, I think we ought to select a commission composed of experts on tuberculosis to locate these hospitals, and I think that this commission ought to be instructed to divide the country into districts—say three or four districts. I make this last suggestion for two reasons: First, because we know that climate is not considered essential, and that it is better to treat a patient in the climate to which he is accustomed and where he intends to live after he is cured; second, because if these hospitals are located in these different districts—east, west, south, and in the center—it will be possible for the parents of these boys to visit them from time to time, which will keep them more cheerful, and we know what effect the mind has on the body in the treatment of disease.

Now, gentlemen, I thought I would make these suggestions for your consideration, with the view of getting quick results. Bear this in mind: Talk will not cure tuberculosis. If this Congress is going to do anything at all for the men who contracted tuberculosis in the service, something must be done right away so that these men can be treated now. If you wait until they have large cavities in their lungs, it will do no good.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAZARO. I will.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman enlarge upon the point he made that we must treat the man in the same climate in which he is to live after he is cured? That appeals to me; but it seems to me that is usually disregarded in taking people and placing them in sanatoriums in some particular kind of a climate, without any regard to the place where they are to live afterwards.

Mr. LAZARO. We know to-day that it is best to treat them in the climate in which they are expected to live.

Mr. TILSON. Is it not a fact that a man can go into a very dry climate, say, and be cured, and then if he returns to some other country from which he came, with a different kind of climate from that which he left, he probably takes the disease again and dies?

Mr. LAZARO. That is often the case. I wish to make the suggestion that if we are going to do anything at all for the men who contracted tuberculosis in the service, if we mean what we say, we must do it at once, because the time to treat the tubercular patient is in the beginning of the disease.

Mr. REED. Will the gentleman yield? I think the gentleman is right, but this program for Congress to inaugurate will take time, and in the meantime would it not be feasible to gather the worst cases together and put them into tents until the other program is ready?

Mr. LAZARO. I think a commission composed of experts on tuberculosis could have these hospitals ready within a very short time, provided we get at it right away.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore].

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, it was a very interesting speech that of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND], on the subject of the budget, and it drew forth some interrogatories that were equally interesting, particularly those in regard to the "pork-barrel" system as it is supposed to exist, and especially at this time, when the two bills referred to as being "pork-barrel" bills occupy so modest a place in the appropriations of Congress.

I have before me a statement made by the Hon. SWAGAR SHERLEY, of Kentucky, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, summarizing the appropriations made for the present fiscal year. They mount up to more than \$24,000,000,000. The public building and grounds bill, charged with being a "pork-barrel" bill, is not mentioned in this list at all, and the river and harbor bill, which gets a very great deal of undeserved criticism, is referred to as having been passed with a paltry appropriation of only \$23,000,000.

But the purpose for which I took the floor, Mr. Chairman, is to discuss not the budget system, but passing events.

It may not be unconstitutional for the President of the United States to go abroad to personally attend to such important business as must be transacted at the peace conference, but his going will probably be more criticized than any other of his public acts disregarding American precedents and traditions. While the President may deserve popular acclaim abroad—he

has certainly rendered great service to the allies—we may fairly ask, What is it that he can do that could not have been done by proper and accredited representatives of the United States, who do not owe to the more than 100,000,000 Americans the constant oversight that is expected of a President? In other words, why could the President not have remained at his post of duty in the United States, where his presence is required daily and hourly, leaving it to the loyalty, integrity, and patriotism of other Americans whom he might have appointed to transact the business that must be transacted at the peace conference?

AMERICAN ALTRUISM.

In many respects, gentlemen of the House, we have been drifting from our national moorings during the last six years. It has come to be a habit. A spirit of cosmopolitan altruism like unto which there has been nothing in the history of the world seems to pervade our national life. There seems to be nothing which other nations ask of us that we will not give. The United States is supposed to be rich and prosperous, and therefore it is easy for the people of the United States to give, even to the point of suffering, in order that others who are competitors, in a commercial sense, may have and hold. That which we would not do generations ago because we believed that "he who provideth not for his own household is worse than an infidel," we now seem to want to do without any regard to the consequences of the accounting we must make.

I pause parenthetically to say that though we hear much about what other nations have done in the great world war there will be an accounting that we all, from the President down, must make to the American people, and particularly to the American taxpayer, who does not yet know what burdens have been levied on him in the interest of our allies, and in order that our own arms might be strengthened in this war.

We built the Panama Canal thinking it to be an American enterprise, and the President, as a candidate for President, insisted that it was our canal, and that it should be used by our ships, and that they should have a preference, and that the promise made in that regard "was not molasses to catch flies." But after he had entered his high office his attitude changed toward that project, and we are now told that the canal is as much for the use of other nations as for our own. I do not object to other nations using the canal, but we are compelled under existing conditions, in spite of our effort and expenditure, to give them what is in effect a seeming preference over the United States in that their shipping, apart from canal tolls, may be more cheaply conducted than our own.

And again I pause to say there is a propaganda now on in the United States which is intended to teach our easy-minded and easy-going American people that the Panama Canal should be given over as a peace offering to the nations of the world, and particularly to those who are stronger upon the high seas than we are. We have been observing a little of this free and easy disposition of our property, paid for by the taxes of the American people, in Mr. Hurley's speeches concerning the American merchant marine. One would think, judging from some of his utterances, that the billions we are spending for ships, some of them to carry American troops abroad and to bring American troops back—troops that arrived in the nick of time to save Europe and to prevent the overthrow of the democracy for which we enlisted in this fight—were spent merely to aid our competitors for the world's trade; those whom we have helped in this war and who have been protecting their markets in South America and the Orient while we were providing the men and the money to make the war a success.

Credit may be given to the British Navy—only a day or two ago the people of the United States celebrated the glory of British arms—credit may be given the British Navy for helping us to get our troops to Europe—and we seem to have paid well for that service—but while we are giving credit, a credit that may well be deserved, we should not forget that we had a Navy of our own and that that Navy was supposed to be working while all this foreign fighting was going on. Where was our American Navy when all this glorious work was being done by the British Navy? Surely we were not inactive. I made some inquiries of the Navy Department when the American ships struck by German submarines were going down upon our own coast. I learned our Navy was largely abroad or conveying troopships. We were protecting others who were supposed to be protecting us, and we were giving to them our torpedo-boat destroyers, some we sorely needed along our own coast to save our own ships, some of which were sacrificed in order that our troops could go abroad to save the European situation. While we are celebrating other navies, therefore, we do not want to minimize our own. We were certainly not idle on the other side of the water when our naval vessels were needed there.

GOING AFTER TRADE.

Were we following up our trade routes all that time? Were our American ships sent down to South America and the Orient and the Orient? They were not. They were busy on this war business. And while they were busy were our competitors ignoring their opportunities in South America? Were they avoiding these channels of commerce? The testimony of American business men who ran up against all kinds of restrictions and limitations indicates they were not. They were looking after their business all the time, even when our coastwise trade was going down upon the Atlantic shores. Our business seems to have been war business exclusively, as much for the benefit of other nations as for ourselves. These are matters which the President may discuss with foreign nations when he arrives on the other side, but they certainly should not be settled to the disadvantage of American interests nor should we permit them to be so settled.

We have passed laws, like the seaman's law, which was sanctioned by the President, which would lead to the impression that our business is to dedicate ourselves and our resources to foreign nations, while they go about their business gobbling up the trade of the world. The President should watch that situation. In fact, there is a great deal about the President's foreign tour, with all the spectacular features that must necessarily accompany it, that may well give concern to old-line Americans who resent one-man power in the United States and who insist upon an old-fashioned democracy.

Our Government thus far has been conducted on a democratic basis, except as it came dangerously close to autocracy during the war period, and it is not altogether clear that the danger line has been passed even at the present moment. The President has gone abroad, leaving the White House vacant, and we must now await further developments.

Meanwhile we are told that the cables between the United States and Europe are to be put under Government control, and following that is the announcement that the President's Information Bureau, headed by Mr. Creel, who magnanimously announces that he will not ask Congress for any more money, since the President has enough in his special \$100,000,000 fund to care for publicity, is to be the advance agent of the foreign expedition.

GETTING THE PRESIDENT'S APPROVAL.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield for a question? Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. A practical question in legislation connected with the subject of the gentleman's discussion. The Constitution provides in section 7 of Article I that before a bill which has passed the House and Senate becomes a law it must be presented to the President of the United States for his signature, and so forth. I would like to know how the gentleman interprets the word "presentation" in that connection, whether in his judgment it means an actual physical presentation or whether there is such a thing as a constructive presentation of a bill?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am not a constitutional lawyer, but I understand the Constitution to require the actual physical presentation of a bill, because of the personal signature of the President. It must be signed, and therefore the President himself must see the bill.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I am thinking particularly of one piece of legislation which Congress has been urgently requested to pass by the Executive, and that is the revenue legislation. Suppose it were possible for the Senate to consider that bill in 10 days and send it to the House; that it was sent to conference, and it was actually passed by both Houses within two weeks from to-day. Would it be possible for that bill to become a law before the 1st of January?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It might become a law without the President's signature in 10 days.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Ten days after presentation?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I understand the gentleman. He presents a rather complicated proposition, which the constitutional lawyers now advising the President might very well answer.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The matter of actual physical presentation is one of which I will be very glad to have a definition. Does it mean that the person carrying it must go exactly to the President himself and put the bill before him, finding the way to his room and laying it down before him? What does he mean by physical presentation?

Mr. LONGWORTH. The provision goes on to say that if he approves it, he shall sign it. He can not sign it unless it is pre-

sented to him. If not, he shall return it with his objections to the House. He must have the bill in his hands.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Then the Clerk of the House or the Senate, as the case may be, must go through to the President himself, through all the rooms as they may be formed, and present the bill physically? Is that the gentleman's construction?

Mr. LONGWORTH. The gentleman concludes that the President can not sign the bill unless his hands are actually on the bill.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I am talking about the definition of physical presentation as the gentleman stated it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman from Ohio yield to me?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman think that a signature by wireless or through a spiritualistic medium would be a physical presentation?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Absent treatment, in other words, of a bill?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Then just exactly what is physical presentation?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The handing of the bill to the President, who takes it in his own hand.

Mr. LONGWORTH. And takes a pen.

Mr. GARNER. The gentlemen know that that process has not been actually gone through in 25 years.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That may be. Very many unprecedented things have been done in this administration.

DOUBT ABOUT THE REVENUE BILL.

Mr. GARNER. Under the administration of the gentleman's party no such thing ever happened.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think if I were President I would not go abroad under the circumstances, seeing my responsibility to the people of the United States.

Mr. GARNER. If the gentleman were President—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. We would have a fine Government then. [Laughter.]

Mr. LONGWORTH. May I ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] whether he believes a revenue bill can be passed before the 1st of January without the President's actual signature on the bill?

Mr. GARNER. If it were passed at this time I think the President's signature could be attached to it before the 1st of January.

Mr. LONGWORTH. How could it be done?

Mr. GARNER. It could be presented to him.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Precisely; and he would sign it.

Mr. GARNER. It is not necessary to fight your way to see the President. All you have to do is to give a bill to some one, who will hand it to the President, and that has been the policy for 25 years.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Has the gentleman been able to see the President lately without fighting his way?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Could the gentleman from Texas, a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee, who is conversant with the methods of the other body and with the White House methods, inform the House whether there is any likelihood of the revenue bill passing another body so that it may be presented to the President of the United States?

Mr. GARNER. Apparently there is not much prospect before the 1st of January, with the disposition of certain elements in another body with which the gentleman is more familiar than I am.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That is entirely nonpartisan?

Mr. GARNER. Entirely.

Mr. STEVENSON. As to the question of the presentation to the President, is the term "presentation" there anywhere different from the general legal term of presentation which governs the presentation of all negotiable paper and things of that kind, where they present it to the general office and place the business and it becomes binding?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think there is a difference where a signature is required. The President can not sign by proxy.

Mr. STEVENSON. The acceptance of a paper?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If he did sign by proxy and sent his check to a bank in which the gentleman from South Carolina has considerable interest, he would probably be arrested for forgery.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. DAVIS. How much more time does the gentleman want?
Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I would like to have 15 minutes more.

Mr. DAVIS. I yield 15 minutes more to the gentleman.

UNITED STATES NOT AN EASY MARK.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Further, I would say, the Republicans in the Senate have already indicated their purpose to exercise the right conferred upon them by the people in the Constitution. Does this mean they fear the President of the United States in the course of his foreign pilgrimage may make agreements with foreign nations that would not be sanctioned by the representatives of the American people in Congress assembled, or does it mean that the Senate and the House of Representatives, which have yielded to many requests of the President during the war, have determined, now that the war is over, to demand an accounting in the name of the people for the expenditure of funds and the creation of commissions and bureaus, the continuation of which is being sought at the expense of the people?

These are questions that may actuate another body. I do not know. Certainly they are questions that come directly home to the people and will, I trust, have due consideration when the people come to consider paying for the war, paying for the troops abroad, and paying for such agreements as may be made, which do not have the sanction of the representatives of the people in Congress assembled.

At any rate it was well that the people should have put a Republican Congress on guard at this particular juncture. We have been mighty generous under the Wilson administration to almost everybody on earth. We will have a big bill to pay, and we will pay it, but there seems no good reason why those who advocate a democracy should not now demand a halt upon that irritating tendency toward autocracy that has characterized many of the bureaucracies created under cover of war. Up to date the administration has refused the cooperation of Congress to check up expenditures and to prevent extravagance and waste. A Republican Congress should seek to protect the interests of the people of the United States and prevent their becoming an "easy mark" for competitive nations or for ambitious men who seem to regard our wonderful resources as a melon to be cut. There is plenty of room under the Constitution as it now stands for a restoration of trade and business on normal lines where every willing worker may have an equal opportunity to make the most of his labor and capital. The United States normal in trade and industry has generally been far in advance of that of any other nation, and with autocratic governmental restrictions removed and adequate protection assured it should never fall below the high standard we have set for it.

PRESIDENT'S ECONOMIC THEORIES.

When the President made his declaration to Congress, enumerating the 14 points which he intended should be submitted to the peace commissioners when appointed, he made a startling statement in point 3, which has been confusing to the minds of many people, particularly those engaged in the industries of the United States, and it will bear repeating at this time, particularly in view of the fact that in his farewell message to Congress the President failed to take the Congress or the people into his confidence in regard to what he meant by that particular point 3.

What was it? A condition for the peace delegates, when assembled, to consider, emanating from the President of the United States, by which apparently he intended to be bound as the President of the United States or through such representatives as he might send. I will read it:

3. The removal, so far as possible, of all economic barriers and the establishment of an equality of trade conditions among all the nations consenting to the peace and associating themselves for its maintenance.

I am frank to say that many Republicans, when the President read that point 3, were alarmed at his attitude in an international sense. They knew that the President was inclined toward free trade; that he believed in a leveling of the tariff barriers. He had said so. There was no doubt in their minds as to his theoretical position, but they did not believe that the President would seriously carry those theories of his against the wishes, certainly, of the greater half of the people of the United States into an international conference by which the United States was to be bound. The President said, on coming to Congress the first time, away back on April 8, 1913, when he first ascended this American "throne":

Our task is to square them with the actual facts. The sooner that is done the sooner we shall escape from suffering from the facts and the sooner our men of business will be free to thrive by the law of nature—the nature of free business—instead of by the law of legislation and artificial arrangement.

What did he mean? He meant that all business should be free from tariff restrictions, because further he said:

It is plain what those principles must be. We must abolish everything—

Observe, "abolish everything"—

that bears even the semblance of privilege of any kind or artificial advantage, and put our business men and producers under the stimulation of a constant necessity to be efficient, economical, and enterprising, masters of competitive supremacy, better workers and merchants than any in the world. Aside from the duties laid on articles which we do not, and probably can not, produce, therefore, and the duties laid upon luxuries and merely for the sake of the revenues they yield, the object of the tariff duties henceforth laid must be effective competition, the whetting of American wits by contest with the wits of the rest of the world.

TREATING AMERICAN BUSINESS ROUGH.

"The whetting of American wits by contest with the wits of the rest of the world." Yes. There was no misunderstanding the President in 1913. Apparently he had not changed his position upon this point, although he may have changed it upon one hundred other points. He meant that we should break down all tariff barriers and set the business of the United States where it would be hopelessly in competition with all other industrial business in the world, where the Fiji Islander with his product should be on an equality with the producer of citrus fruits in Florida; where the Hindu who made his cotton bagging should be on an equality with the man who manufactured cotton products in Massachusetts or elsewhere in the New England States or in the Southern States as far down the line as Texas. It meant that the man who could work for a trifling wage in the mills or shipyards of Japan should be put in competition with the highly paid worker in the American mills and in the American shipyards.

We disputed this theory of the President then, and now that he has told us of his political preferences—I refer to the letter which he wrote 10 days before the election—we are privileged to refer to it again, even though he has voluntarily, and without telling us just the reason why, gone on a mission abroad of great import to the people of the United States, and consequently to the people of the world. Yes; the President has been consistent in his desire to overthrow the preference which the industries of the United States have had by virtue of wise Republican laws, even from the first enactment of Congress down to the present time. Therein lies our danger in the conferences that may take place in Europe.

But we are talking reconstruction now. We are all for reconstruction in the United States. The foreign nations are talking reconstruction also. Every one of our allies is talking reconstruction, and many of them are reconstructing with the help and assistance of the people of the United States. Our rivers and harbors got \$23,000,000 in the bill passed by this House last year merely to keep our streams in order, that we might get our ships carrying troops out of our harbors into foreign ports; but we have sent over \$8,000,000,000 of American money with which they have not only been improving their rivers and harbors and building railroads, but with which they have been constructing canals for purposes of war at present but for purposes of peace thereafter. That is the condition. So that when this peace arrangement is settled and we again begin to talk about improving something in the United States we may find that they have already "reconstructed" over there, with assistance we have given them, while we refused to spend in our own behalf over here even to the extent of a pittance.

OTHER NATIONS RECONSTRUCTING.

Mr. FOCHT. Does the gentleman believe there will be any way of ascertaining how much money America has advanced for the purpose of making improvements that will be used to compete with the United States after the close of the war?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I voted for every loan, and I stand by the propriety of sending that money abroad. But there is not a foreign nation that was advantaged by these loans that has not been making internal improvements along with its war plans, while we have been forgetting to do that same thing here for ourselves.

I am going to read to you, not from the President of the United States, who is strong on theories and stands for them in the matter of leveling tariff barriers, but from the most recent report of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce of the Department of Commerce. The chief of that bureau went abroad for the purpose of examining this question of reconstruction on the other side. And what does he say in this report, which is just fresh from Europe?

The outstanding fact under observation is the recognition in every land and by all statesmen of the problem called "economic reconstruction." But of more immediate importance is the fact that England, France, Italy, Germany, and Austria are making preparations to re-

sume their peaceful economic life with improved facilities for foreign trade, with a national supervision of the use of natural resources for the benefit of their own citizens, and with assistance from the State.

While I realize that many plans advocated or adopted in the foreign countries are unsuitable or even unnecessary for the United States, I feel impelled to point out that those plans might involve prejudice to the interests of the United States in foreign fields if they should be administered in a narrow spirit or if the United States should fail to make plain its own interest in them.

That is what England, France, Italy, Germany, and Austria are doing.

What are we doing? Well, for one thing we are still making loans to the allies. Is anybody worrying about a river and harbor "pork" bill just now? Why, we appropriated \$23,000,000 for that purpose this year. Still some people worry over it and continue to grieve. Why, I venture to say that more than \$23,000,000 was spent on canals in France alone during this war. And yet we have sent approximately \$8,000,000,000 to the allies and are preparing to send more even after the war.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GARNER. Has the gentleman looked at the make-up of the next Rivers and Harbors Committee? If you take seniority as the rule, has the gentleman looked to see who will be the active members of the majority in the Rivers and Harbors Committee in the next Congress?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have not looked at it specifically. I will say to the gentleman that the committee is now at work preparing a bill, which I assume will be reported to the House in the next two or three weeks.

Mr. GARNER. What I am speaking of is the make-up of the committee in the next Congress. If seniority rules, who will be on the conference committees and in charge of the work of that committee?

UNITED STATES SHOULD WAKE UP.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have not examined the personnel in particular. Of course it will be Republican next year, and if anything I have said will be of advantage to the Republicans I hope they will profit by it, just as I would expect my Democratic friends to do under like circumstances.

But this chief of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce in the Department of Commerce goes on, in his report to the Secretary, as follows:

Although the various countries will, for a while, undoubtedly work toward economic self-sufficiency and toward the elimination of enemy interests in the exploitation of their resources, it is essential that each of the allied countries should frame its program and the administration of its program with full realization of the extent to which the interests of all the other allied countries are involved. We have no reason to anticipate a purely selfish spirit on the part of any of our allies. It is quite natural, inevitable really, that they should plan as soon as possible to recover their industrial, commercial, and financial equilibrium. It is for us, however, to stand ready to enter, at the proper moment, upon an understanding which will show our appreciation of the community of interest in the larger aspects of trade and economic intercourse after the war, and which will be in harmony with the motives underlying our participation in the war.

Mr. McFADDEN. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. McFADDEN. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that five days after the signing of the armistice the English started practically all of their old steamship lines, running to all the ports of the world?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think that is correct. I know that from August, 1914, down to the present time American shipping has had to go through foreign influence in order to get anywhere. That condition still prevails. I have pending in the State Department now certain claims of American citizens who were wronged upon the high seas. I have been before the State Department in their behalf, but they have been advised to go and try their cases in the courts of London.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. May I have an indefinite time, not to take more than 10 minutes?

Mr. DAVIS. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. May I have 10 minutes?

Mr. DAVIS. I will yield to the gentleman 10 minutes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will cease quoting from the report of the Chief of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce in the Department of Commerce, because it is conclusive. It differs from the President's "leveling" process, but nevertheless it is conclusive. It is in the nature of a warning to both sides of the House—a warning to Democrats of what might ensue if we follow literally the President's primary proposition to break down the tariff barriers, or his secondary

proposition carried over to the peace conference, to effect a leveling of all economic barriers, which I take to mean the same thing. And I would suggest to the Republicans that unless we stand firm to our principles in this matter of reconstruction we may be found wanting by the majority of the people of the United States, who, in view of the recent election, expect that we will hold in check even the highest in the land upon this question of the removal of the economic barriers that have protected American industry and American labor. [Applause.]

FOREIGN COMPETITION TOO STRONG.

Here is a report from our Democratic Tariff Commission, the United States Tariff Commission appointed by President Wilson at a time and under circumstances which led many of us to believe that perhaps the Democrats might be coming over to a protective policy and were about to leave their false gods. The chairman of the board is Prof. Taussig, who has been quoted in many ways, a very able and learned man. It delights me to quote from this report the statements these eminent Democrats have made. The matter of the manufacture of surgical instruments is dealt with in this report. It is not a large industry in the United States, but we find on examining the report that when the Underwood law—that marvelous bit of legislation passed in October, 1913—was in effect we made only about 10 per cent of the surgical instruments used in the United States. The rest were made in Germany. Some of us on our side of the House knew of this condition, but it was a matter of no great concern to those who believed in the economic policies of the President. But here—and I am not desiring to quote the President's agents against him, although the Department of Commerce has been of some service in that regard—I recur to the report of the Tariff Commission on surgical instruments as at once reaching the crux of the whole argument. The report says:

The testimony of men familiar with German conditions, men who recently visited that country, indicates that the wages paid to German instrument makers in 1914 ranged from \$7.30 to \$10 a week, and the average was about \$8.20.

The average shipyard worker has been getting that much per day in the United States, and yet these skilled surgical instrument makers in 1914 made \$8.20 a week. The American wages at that time, as quoted in this same report, were \$21 to \$22; that was about the average pay in the United States.

Query for the Republicans and Democrats and for the President in conference with the crowned heads of Europe next week: How can the American manufacturer of surgical instruments survive if foreign labor is paid \$8.20 and the American labor is paid \$22 and more now, since these are the figures of 1914? Theorists may answer that question, but practical men can not.

Here is what the Tariff Commission say about the tariff bill—the Underwood tariff bill of October, 1913. Note that what they say is said so gently as to reduce the disastrous effects of the Underwood bill to a minimum:

The tariff reduction of 1913.—The duty on miscellaneous metal manufactures, the classification under which the bulk of surgical instruments are imported, was reduced by the act of 1913 from 45 per cent ad valorem to 20 per cent. Because of the lack of statistics showing separately the value of surgical instruments imported, it is impossible to determine the effect of the reduction in the duty upon the amount of foreign instruments brought into this country. There are indications, however, that the prices of instruments of foreign manufacture were not correspondingly reduced. The wholesalers uniformly refused to make any reduction to retailers in the prices of the instruments imported under the act of 1909, on which they had paid the 45 per cent duty. They agreed, however, to give a discount on orders placed with them for import under the new tariff.

But the German manufacturers, meanwhile, had raised their prices, and consequently the prices the retailers eventually had to pay for the instruments imported under the new arrangement did not differ materially from the prices they had paid under the old tariff. The increase in the prices of German instruments had been contemplated for some time. For several years before 1913, the costs of manufacture in Germany had been rising, but the keen competition of producers had kept prices down. Finally, however, the German manufacturers succeeded in forming an effective organization and agreed upon a uniform price policy. It is possible that they chose the time of the reduction in the American tariff as an opportunity to put in force the price increase.

WAGES IN THE COTTON MILLS.

I was talking with New Bedford manufacturers a few days ago and with some of the great cotton manufacturers of Fall River, and I inquired as to the wages of weavers—men and women—in the cotton mills, where they fabricate the raw product that the South is raising, and where we would fabricate more if the South would encourage them a little more than they do foreign nations, and they said that while they were paying \$24 a week they were now, since the war closed, beginning to anticipate the competition of Japan, where they are skillful in weaving and now pay the weavers 8 to 10 cents a day.

Gentlemen, I ask both sides of this House, I ask the President of the United States when he comes to "remove the economic barriers" over there in the peace conference, if that is his purpose, to consider whether we can pay \$24 to the cotton weavers in America while they can weave cotton in Japan at 10 cents a day?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Before we went into this war men were going out to work all over the country, and we had an insufficient tariff law and insufficient protection. Does the gentleman know any plan that has been presented by the present administration or by the party in power that will protect us after the war is over from a similar condition on the signing of the peace treaty?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I know of no other recourse to which they have resorted. They have stood by the Underwood bill even when that bill was bringing the country to financial disaster. The President, it will be recalled, had to come in and ask for \$100,000,000 to save the situation; and then he came in and asked for another \$100,000,000, and he kept on coming here and asking for more money, which we had to raise by direct taxation, until we got used to it. When the war broke out he did not have to come on economic grounds, because the war closed up German shipping and foreign competition, and gave us a protection which no law of the land could give.

Mr. STEVENSON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. STEVENSON. Did I understand the gentleman to say that preparations were being made to reduce the wages of the weavers in the cotton mills of New England?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. No; they desire to keep them up if possible.

Mr. STEVENSON. But they were expecting to have to reduce them?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I said, and I will ask the gentleman to bear with me, that no American manufacturer could pay \$24 a week to a weaver and remain in business in competition with a Japanese institution which paid 10 cents a day. Now, if the gentleman can show how that can be done—

Mr. STEVENSON. Then I misunderstood the gentleman's statement if he did not say that they expected to have to reduce the wages. I will ask the gentleman if he knew that they were selling their goods at prices fixed by the Government on a basis of 36-cent cotton and that they are paying 26 cents for the cotton? That is what they are doing, and if they are prepared to reduce the wages of their employees then they are simply taking it out of the employees.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I do not know how the gentleman gets—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Here I am stopped right in the middle of a sentence, and I must ask the gentleman from Minnesota to give me two or three minutes more.

Mr. DAVIS. Since one of the parties to whom I had apportioned time says he does not care to use his time, I will yield the gentleman 10 minutes more.

COTTON MILLS CAUTIOUS.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota. He is getting to be a very good chairman of the committee. [Laughter.] Answering the gentleman from South Carolina, I will say this: He is a cotton factor and better posted on the subject of raw material than I am. I do not know just what the actual price of cotton is to-day, but I do know that throughout the whole of this war, though cotton was ably defended and ably promoted on this floor by the gentleman from South Carolina and another gentleman, who comes, I think, from Alabama, if my memory serves me right—

Mr. STEVENSON. Possibly Texas.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That they never could induce the President of the United States to fix a price on cotton, and somehow or other they never could get the President to include cotton in the embargo list. It just so happened with regard to cotton, by reason of the peculiar political complexion of this House about which I do not now complain, that the President seemed to be under some occult influence which kept cotton right side up all the way through.

Mr. STEVENSON. I know the gentleman intends to be correct—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And to be frank with the gentleman, although I tried here several times in perfectly good faith in view of our vast financial obligations to impose a little bit of a tax on cotton—something like \$3 a bale—I could not get it through. We did not have enough votes.

Mr. STEVENSON. The gentleman means to be correct, and the gentleman stated that cotton could not be embraced in the embargo. Does not the gentleman know there could not be a pound of cotton shipped without a license, and that in a very large part of the world it was not allowed to be shipped—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I recall and the gentleman from South Carolina will remember distinctly that when the President issued his embargo proclamation including those things which should not go abroad, that for some reason or other—I could not just say whether due to influence on that side or not—it did not include cotton. You could find flour, beef, and things of one kind and another, but cotton was not to be found on the list, search as you please.

Mr. STEVENSON. The gentleman did not try to ship any cotton.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. At that time the attention of the House was called to the fact that cotton was going into Germany—

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That cotton, though contraband, was still going into Germany, and we could not get head or tail of that. It was going to Germany and they were turning it into explosives to shoot us up. We could not stop it; cotton had full swing. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Does not the gentleman know that the New England manufacturers are having contracts canceled; in fact, that their business is disappearing at the present time and has been since the armistice was signed?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I believe the gentleman is entirely correct. It is reported that several large mills have closed. On a recent trip to Fall River and New Bedford I found there was much concern, because they had large investments, and they began to feel that business was being taken away from them. They were not enthusiastic about the removal of these economical barriers to which the President referred before going to the peace conference.

WHAT AMERICA MUST PAY.

Now, I want to say something about reconstruction. Every foreign nation is prepared to reconstruct. Make no mistake about that. It is true, perhaps, we are going to sell them material with which to reconstruct, a great deal of material, but we will not sell a pound to any nation that can provide for itself; do not make any mistake about that. We have not only loaned them approximately \$8,000,000,000, but this morning a request has come forward from the Secretary of the Treasury to increase the foreign loans in the sum of one and a half billion dollars. So when you say we are going to reconstruct and you talk of the United States as a great and rich and prosperous country, just bear in mind that we spent approximately \$13,000,000,000 up to the end of last June, and have got most of it to pay back in some way or other.

Do not forget, when this spirit of cosmopolitan altruism overcomes your patriotic souls, that in addition to what we spent last year we have appropriated this year, 1919, upward of \$24,000,000,000. We have authorized the expenditure of every cent of it. The chairman of the Appropriations Committee [Mr. SHERLEY] came here and gave us his statement and the Secretary of the Treasury confirmed it. Put that against your \$13,000,000,000 already spent and up to the end of June, 1919, you will have spent, or have authorized to be spent, a total of \$37,000,000,000, plus the deficiency bill appropriation. Of course, we are going to save some of this. Of the \$8,000,000,000 to be raised by taxation it is announced that \$2,000,000,000 can be saved. That remains to be seen.

But counting out the 1918 bill and dealing only with the authorizations of 1919, it will be remembered that after we had provided the \$24,000,000,000 reported by Mr. SHERLEY we were obliged to report a deficiency bill for \$7,000,000,000 additional. That made a 1919 total to date of \$31,000,000,000, a staggering sum, but involving an indebtedness you will have to talk about back home in every district in this land when the tax and interest bills come along in due course. And they will keep on coming along for years and for generations, and it will be pay, pay, pay for us while the foreign trade is being picked up by many of our allies—God bless our allies! We hail their brave and patriotic work—but when our own people begin to realize the extent to which they have been involved in this war they will at least want to keep their mills open and their wheels turning under the shelter of reasonable economic barriers and without being forced "to whet their wits" and wages against the cheap industrial world abroad. [Applause.] I wanted to sound a little warning, because we have been a mighty easy people.

We are just as brave as any on the other side; we have as many courageous men; we stepped in when we were needed and

save the day for our allies. Do not forget that when you praise the flags of other nations. We have not stinted ourselves in men or money, but we are not necessarily called to bear the whole burden nor to place it upon the backs of our children for generations to come. A great and glorious Nation is the United States, but she needs protection now as she never did before in her history. [Applause on the Republican side.]

We will get back to normal. Yes. We ought to get back to normal; but we have that one strange condition staring us in the face. Our spokesman, our sole representative, our overtowering personality in this great conference of the nations of the Old World, pledged to his economic theories, wedded to the destruction of every artificial barrier which heretofore protected the United States, has not taken the Congress or the people into his confidence.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. SNYDER. After the one superior gentleman that you have been referring to returns from abroad, what position do you think the rest of our delegation will take on this same question?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Those who have accompanied him?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The President appointed every one who went with him. Some of them we know, some of them we know not so well. But the gentleman from New York has the temerity to think that any one of the gentlemen appointed by the President will differ from him in view—no Member of the House or Senate being present—it seems to me he is going astray. No; those gentlemen accompanying him will stand with the President.

Our danger, then, is this: Holding these views, standing for the destruction of the artificial barriers of protection which have made the United States prosperous and strong, reiterating them in point 3 of his 14 points, so that England and other nations take free trade to be his meaning, we may find ourselves in disagreement when as a people and a Nation we might hope in such a crisis to stand together and as one man. It certainly can not be that the majority of the American people are ready to accept a free-trade policy. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. Young] such time as he may desire.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, there has been considerable misapprehension as to the price guaranteed for wheat for the year 1919. As you all know, there was no price guaranteed for the crop of 1917. That crop was handled on the price fixed by a committee named by the President for that purpose. As to the crop of 1918, while there was a guaranty in an act of Congress of \$2 per bushel, the United States Grain Corporation handled that crop for a considerable margin over that sum. So that practically the crops of 1917 and 1918 were handled without regard to any guaranty made by Congress. Now, we are faced with the problem of the guaranty for 1919, and, as I have hinted, there is considerable misapprehension among the Members of Congress—and I might say outside of Congress—as to just what that guaranty means. I desire to have printed in the RECORD for the information of the Members certain documents issued by the Food Administration, the vice president of the Food Administration Grain Corporation, and the President of the United States, and I wish to call particular attention to the thoughtful letter of Vice President Crowell and the recommendations made by him.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the matter indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. An examination of these documents, I think, will make it clear to the minds of all that while the guaranty for the wheat crop for 1919 is specific, no agency has been created to carry that guaranty into effect.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from North Dakota yield?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Yes; I do.

Mr. STEENERSON. Was not that the very purpose of the Food Administration's grain corporation, authorized under the authority of the proclamation of the President, under the laws of Delaware, first capitalized at \$50,000,000 and the capital afterwards increased to \$150,000,000, through which the Food Administration has been buying grain, especially wheat, for the Government and for the allies?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. One of the documents that I will put into the RECORD is a letter from the Food Administration Grain Corporation of New York, in which it is stated that the

corporation was organized for the specific purpose of handling the crops of 1917 and 1918, and there is nothing in the authority given to them up to this time which would warrant their handling the crop of 1919.

Mr. STEENERSON. Does the gentleman print the actual articles of incorporation and the proclamation under which that was done?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I am going to put in the RECORD the proclamation of the President.

Mr. STEENERSON. And the articles of incorporation?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I have not got those. If the gentleman has them I will be glad to put them in the RECORD.

Mr. STEENERSON. I have not got them here, but I have a copy at home. But I think the gentleman is mistaken, and the statement of the Food Administration was not well founded, that it was limited to any particular crop. It was limited to the period of the war. That was its whole scope and purpose.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I think the gentleman is referring now to the articles of incorporation issued by the State of Delaware.

Mr. STEENERSON. The President's proclamation authorized the Food Administration to incorporate under the laws of the State of Delaware. Its object was, as stated in those articles, to buy grain, and it was not limited. There is nothing in those articles that limits it to one crop.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. As the gentleman knows, it frequently happens that when corporations are incorporated they are authorized to do many things that are perhaps contrary to the laws of the land, and in this case, of course, the incorporation in Delaware could not give the corporation any greater powers than had been already authorized by Congress.

Mr. STEENERSON. If the gentleman will yield further, I will say I do not think that is a matter that comes up in this consideration. I was simply referring to the letter of the Food Administration to the gentleman, in which they say they were limited to the one crop. I maintain that if you examine the law and the proclamation and the articles which were formed in pursuance of that law you will find it was not limited to that crop.

I would like to have the gentleman yield further in order to permit me to inquire if the gentleman has been able to get the report of the Food Administration for the last fiscal year?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I have not seen that report yet.

Mr. STEENERSON. I will say to the gentleman that I have inquired at the document room, and there has been no report since that for the year 1917.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Of course, the gentleman's question as to whether the Grain Corporation can extend its operations over another year is comparatively unimportant, because it would be an easy matter, anyway, to extend their authority. The real question, the real problem, is whether that corporation, if it is extended, will have sufficient funds to back up the guaranty that has been made, because I think it very clear that they can not pay the farmers for the wheat unless they have the money with which to pay it.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Yes.

Mr. STEVENSON. I noticed what purported to be an interview with the gentleman from North Dakota a day or two ago in the newspapers, in which it was stated that the Government would probably lose a million dollars on account of its guaranty. Did the gentleman mean to confine it to one million, or was that a mistake?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. As a matter of fact, I did not hand out a statement like that. I was incorrectly quoted in one of the papers here as saying there would be a million dollars lost.

Mr. STEVENSON. What loss will there be?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I would not want to state what it will be. It seems to me the amount of loss will be dependent on how we back the Food Administration Grain Corporation. The officers of that corporation are playing a pretty big game. They have in sight a wheat crop bigger than any raised before, so far as the acreage is concerned. Heretofore they have been selling to people in Europe who wanted the wheat and who were prepared to pay the cost price plus the expenses of handling. Now they are confronted with the problem of selling wheat to countries of Europe that have the opportunity of buying their wheat elsewhere and possibly at a lower price. It might at first blush look like a serious situation or we might be facing a big loss, but the fact is that some of this wheat that the papers are talking about which the allies and people of Europe can get is so far away that it takes about 115 days to make a round trip. That is so with respect to the wheat in Aus-

tralia. An ordinary freighter can make just one round trip in 115 days. The same boat can make the trip to Argentina and return in 81 days. It does not seem, with the great shortage they have in shipping now, that they could get their supply, considering the shortage of tonnage, from those countries, and yet it may be that if we do not back up the Food Administration Grain Corporation they may get enough of it from Argentina and Australia to break the market and then subject us to a heavy loss. That loss might run into very large sums.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Yes; certainly.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. The gentleman comes from one of the large wheat-growing States, where there has been a good deal of criticism about the fixing of the price of wheat. They do not want the price removed from the next year's crop, do they?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I will say to the gentleman that our farmers did not ask for the fixing of a price of wheat at all. The fixing of wheat prices was imposed upon them. Now, so far as they are concerned, the price having been fixed and they having been compelled to accept prices much less than they would otherwise have received in an open market, the time has come, in their opinion, for it to operate.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. They do not want that price removed, do they?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. No; they do not.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. I will state to the gentleman that I fought this whole price-fixing scheme.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I know that the gentleman from Texas has been a consistent opponent of all kinds of price fixing on farm products.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. I know that we are up against a serious proposition. I agree with the gentleman. We have got to have some kind of legislation to make this guaranty good.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. That is right.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. I fought this price-fixing scheme, but in good faith to these wheat farmers I am going to do everything in my power to see that they get the guaranteed price fixed for next year's crop, because it has been promised them by legislation.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I appreciate that statement very much, particularly inasmuch as the gentleman is a member of the Committee on Agriculture, and in view of the fact that he while in the committee room and at all times has consistently opposed price fixing. He had the courage to oppose it at a time when it was very popular.

I want to say also that I have not discovered any disposition on the part of any of the officials connected with the Government at Washington to repudiate this guaranty. The only thing I can complain of is this, that some of the officials connected with the Government here, and practically all of them excepting the Food Administration Grain Corporation at New York, seem to think that the price guaranty will be self-executing, and that it will not take any money to back it up. Now, as to the amount of the loss that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. STEVENSON] was asking me about, it would look to me as though the more we give to the Food Administration Grain Corporation, the better support we give them, the more money we give them to make the guaranty good, the less it will cost them to make it good. The public officials of France and Italy and Great Britain are playing a big game. They are out to buy wheat anywhere in the world as cheaply as they can get it. If they can buy a little from Argentina or from Australia, enough to break the market and get the rest over here, of course that will suit them.

Mr. STEENERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Certainly.

Mr. STEENERSON. Does the gentleman think that would be fair dealing on the part of those countries, that Mr. Hoover, the Food Administrator, should go over there and telegraph back to the United States farmer and the public that we must ship 20,000,000 tons of food, largely grain, to Europe; that we must advance large quantities, and then after they have encouraged this production and the exportation of 20,000,000 tons, that these countries which have been benefited shall then go and break the market by importing from Australia and the Argentine? Does the gentleman think that is fair play?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I do not impugn the motives of the officials connected with any other government. I am assuming that they are going to act for their own people.

Mr. BAER. I may say that it is the gentlemen in Minneapolis who break the market. The farmers of my State are glad that the price was fixed at \$2.20 on their wheat, because if it had not been fixed they would only have gotten \$1.25 this fall, compared to the price at which all the other products were sold.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I will ask the gentleman if his friends did not make an attack on the Democratic nominees in that section of the country on the proposition that this administration had fixed the price of wheat?

Mr. BAER. I did not. I upheld the administration, because the farmers up there realized that they would not have received over \$1.25 for their wheat if the price had not been fixed.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I understood that generally that was an issue in the wheat-growing sections of the West. Was it not in Kansas and other wheat-growing sections?

Mr. BAER. I do not know anything about Kansas. The gamblers and speculators were robbing the farmers and the consumers. At Larimore, N. Dak., when wheat flour was \$10.60 wholesale, barley flour was \$14.60; on the same day wheat sold for \$2.04 and barley was only 93 cents.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. The point I was trying to make was this, that if we permit the Food Administration Grain Corporation to run along with the amount of money they have in their treasury now, or with a paltry sum, these fellows across the ocean, who are playing a clever game, will beat them. I think the men who are at the head of our Food Administration Grain Corporation at New York are thoroughly experienced, perhaps the most experienced men that could possibly have been found in the United States. They know the wheat business from the ground up. They are men who have been in the business for 25 or 30 years. They will protect us against loss, in so far as that is possible, if we will give them the necessary financial backing. The farmers have had serious losses on account of arbitrary, unjust, and unfair grading of their grain under grain grades established by the United States Bureau of Markets, but I think I am correct in saying that the farmers desire to see the Food Administration Grain Corporation given ample funds to make the 1919 wheat guaranty good.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield for a question for information?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Yes.

Mr. HARDY. Does the gentleman know what the freight rate is on wheat from New York to Liverpool now?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Freight rates are up and down, and it is impossible to get any quotations on rates for any length of time in advance, but it stands to reason that the freight rates between here and Europe will be very much less at this time, when tonnage is short, than from the Argentine and Australia, and my proposition is this: I do not believe Europe can get enough wheat except from the United States, and if we have men at New York who have the money and have the backing of Congress they can hold that wheat until they can get a reasonable price for it.

Mr. HARDY. Exactly. The reason I asked the question was because the freight on cotton to-day is \$32.50 per bale—that is, \$6.50 a hundred pounds—and I wanted to know if they are knocking wheat anything like as much as they are cotton?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I think the big proposition we ought to keep in mind is this: That if we back our grain officials in New York—Mr. Barnes and Mr. Crowell, who know their business—they are not going to let those fellows in Europe get our wheat from us, where they must get it, for a price that they fix themselves by importing a little from the Argentine and from Australia to break the market. European buyers do not expect to get their wheat supplies from Argentina and Australia. They have not enough ship tonnage. What they want, I repeat, is to get enough from those countries to force a concession in price from us, then they expect to get the wheat from us.

Mr. HARDY. I agree with the gentleman in his contention, but what I wanted to know was whether our freight rates were enormously high on wheat?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. They are high on everything. I can not give the gentleman the exact figures he desires.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Yes.

Mr. SNYDER. The gentleman believes that by giving the wheat corporation a sufficient amount of money they can maintain the price on the prospective crop of next year of a billion bushels of wheat with this surplus of Argentina and other wheat-raising countries. Has the gentleman the slightest idea of what he thinks it would cost this Government to maintain the price and protect the farmers and carry out the guaranty to the Government for the ensuing year on the price of wheat as now fixed?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I think the gentleman will agree with me that it would be an impossible task to estimate what it would cost. It is impossible to say to what extent the Grain Corporation can overcome the present outlook. The loss will be measured by the difference between the price paid to the farmers and the price obtained upon a resale of the wheat.

Mr. SNYDER. I think the gentleman will find that by the time he gets ready to sell the next crop the sentiment in this matter will drop out and competition will prevail, and that the allies will buy wheat where they can buy it, in the cheapest market, without regard to fences put up by this country.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I do not blame them for buying where they can buy the cheapest, but I think it is up to Congress to see that our fellows are put in a condition to meet the competition in the best possible way.

Mr. SNYDER. I want to see the Government carry out its agreement, but it will cost the Government millions to do it.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Whatever it costs it is up to Congress to keep faith with the farmers. My contention is that if we act wisely we will place in the hands of the Food Administration Grain Corporation officials all the money they ask for, even if they ask for \$1,000,000,000. Whatever is not needed will remain in the Treasury. If given ample funds our officials can foil the attempt of European buyers to force a low price upon our wheat. Let Congress put our officials in the position where they can fold their arms and say to the European gentlemen: We have the wheat; it is paid for and stored; you must have it; when you are ready to pay a reasonable price for it you may have it, but not before. [Applause.]

Here is a statement issued by the United States Food Administration, which is typical of a number of statements appearing in the press. It affirms that the guaranteed price for 1919 is to stand, but fails to take into account that it will require an appropriation of money to make it good. Now is the time to face this problem, and not after Congress has adjourned.

STATEMENT OF FOOD ADMINISTRATION.

[From the Official Bulletin, Dec. 4, 1918.]

The guaranteed price of wheat for the 1919 crop stands, by the terms of the Lever Act, under which the United States Food Administration is operating. This statement was made by the Food Administration.

The President's proclamation of September 2, 1918, stated that the "producers of wheat produced within the United States * * * for the crop of 1919" are guaranteed the prices therein set forth, \$2.25 per bushel at Chicago, and the end of the war or the proclamation of peace does not in any way affect this guaranty.

Section 24 of the Lever Act provides "that the provisions of this act shall cease to be in effect when the existing state of war between the United States and Germany shall have terminated, and the fact and date of such termination shall be ascertained and proclaimed by the President; but the termination of this act shall not affect any act done, or any right or obligation accruing or accrued," etc. It further states that "all rights or liabilities under this act arising before its termination shall continue and may be enforced in the same manner as if the act had not terminated."

The guaranty for the 1919 wheat crop expires July 1, 1920.

THE PRESIDENT'S PROCLAMATION.

SEPTEMBER 2, 1918.

In issuing to-day the Government's guaranty of the same price for the 1919 wheat crop that was guaranteed for the 1918 crops I wish it to be understood that in the spring of 1919 I will appoint a disinterested commission, who will secure for me the facts by that time disclosed as to the increased cost of farm labor and supplies, using the three-year prewar average prices of wheat, of labor, and of supply costs as a basis, and that from this information I shall determine whether there should be an increase in price above the present level, and, if so, what advance, in order to maintain for the farmer a good return. Should it then appear that an increase is deserved over the present guaranty, however, it will be applied only to those who have by next harvest already marketed their 1918 wheat.

It is the desire and intention of all departments of the administration to give to the wheat grower a fair and stimulative return in order that the present acreage in wheat may be maintained.

I find a great conflict of opinion among various sections of the country as to the price that should be named as a minimum guaranty. It must be obvious to all, however, that the factors which will make for increased or decreased cost of production of next year's harvest can not be determined until the near approach to the harvest.

In giving a guaranteed price for wheat one year in advance (the only industry guaranteed by the Government) there is involved a considerable national risk. If there should be peace or increased shipping available before the middle of 1920, Europe will naturally supply itself from the large stores of much cheaper wheat now in the Southern Hemisphere; and therefore the Government is undertaking a risk which might in such an event result in a national loss of as much as \$500,000,000 through an unsalable surplus; or, in any event, in maintaining a high level of price to our own people for a long period subsequent to freedom in the world's markets.

Despite this, the desirability of assuring a supply to the world of prime breadstuffs by insuring the farmer against the fluctuations in prices that would result from the uncertainties of the present situation and from the speculation those uncertainties entail, seems to me to make the continuation of the guaranty for another year desirable. On the other hand, it is clear that before increasing this liability by large sums with these risks set forth above, and before increasing the burden of the consumer, the matter should be subjected to searching inquiry at the appropriate time—the time when the pertinent facts will be known.

I feel confident that with this preliminary fixed guaranty, and with the assurance that justice will in any event be done to the grower, he will continue the fine patriotic effort by which he has served the country hitherto; that the Government will have acted prudently; and that the consumer will be satisfied that his interests are not unduly sacrificed, but just and exhaustive consideration given to every element of the matter at the proper time.

WOODROW WILSON.

STATEMENT OF F. G. CROWELL, VICE PRESIDENT OF FOOD ADMINISTRATION GRAIN CORPORATION.

UNITED STATES FOOD ADMINISTRATION.

FOOD ADMINISTRATION GRAIN CORPORATION,

New York, December 7, 1918.

Hon. GEORGE M. YOUNG,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. YOUNG: In further answer to your recent wire in reference to the United States guarantee on the price of the 1919 crop of wheat and the nonexistence of any agency or appropriation to carry the same into effect.

On September 2, 1918, the President of the United States, as provided by act of Congress, fixed the guaranteed price of wheat to be harvested in the United States during the year 1919 and offered for sale by the 1st of June, 1920, provided the producer complied with all the regulations which might be thereafter promulgated in regard to said guarantee by the President of the United States.

The President of the United States, by Executive order, provided, on August 14, 1917, for the creation of the Food Administration Grain Corporation in order to enable the United States Food Administration, acting under the direction of the President, to purchase, provide storage facilities for, and sell at reasonable prices for cash certain commodities, to wit, wheat, flour, meal, beans, and potatoes, and designated Mr. Herbert Hoover, of Washington, D. C.; Mr. Julius H. Barnes, of Duluth, Minn.; Mr. Gates W. McGarrah, of New York City; and Mr. Frank G. Crowell, of Kansas City, Mo., as directors of a corporation to be formed and to have a capital stock of \$50,000,000, all the stock to be owned by the United States of America and to be paid for out of the appropriation of \$150,000,000 made by Congress for the food, fuel, and other agencies created by the congressional act.

The Food Administration Grain Corporation was not ordered or requested to protect the 1918 crop guarantee by Congress, which was a congressional matter and not a Food Administration matter; but inasmuch as Congress had not passed any specific appropriation to protect its own guarantee, the President of the United States issued an Executive order on June 21, 1918, increasing the capital stock of the Food Administration Grain Corporation to \$150,000,000, and ordered it to protect the 1918 price guarantee in addition to performing its other functions.

This the Food Administration Grain Corporation is now doing, and will continue to do until it has fulfilled its obligations as provided by the congressional act, even although it may necessitate its continuing in business until August or September of 1919, for it must continue to exist for this purpose—that is, protecting the 1918 guarantee and protecting its outside obligations—although the United States Food Administration ceases, under the food-control act, on the issuance of a peace proclamation by the President of the United States.

When the Food Administration Grain Corporation was formed it was required that the president, vice president, and 13 second vice presidents, and secretary, located in various parts of the United States, should serve without any remuneration, should give their entire time to the fulfillment of their duties, and should divorce themselves from the grain business by closing out their business, parting with all their stock, and if unable to do the latter that any dividends received from any grain business should be given to the Red Cross or some other national war agency. This was required in order that their policies or action might not be subject to any adverse comment. These 16 executives and heads have done this, and will continue to do this until their public service is ended by the closing up of the obligations of the Food Administration Grain Corporation, which, as I stated above, will be along in August or September of the year 1919.

In my opinion the Food Administration Grain Corporation should liquidate as soon as it has taken care of its obligations and has protected the 1918 crop and wind up its affairs and return to the President of the United States the capital intact intrusted to it, which the officers hope to do, with the feeling on their part that they have executed with a degree of efficiency this public trust.

The next question which will confront Congress is the creation of an agency, perhaps a new corporation, with a much enlarged capital and with the power to draw on the Treasury of the United States freely to meet its obligations, which will be very large in attempting to finance the 1919 crop. Under whose management or control this new agency or corporation shall be is up to Congress.

It has been intimated that some of the personnel connected with the Food Administration Grain Corporation should sacrifice their own interests further and continue to serve the United States Government in the marketing of the 1919 crop. Perhaps Mr. Barnes and some of the other executives or administrative officers will be willing to do this; I do not know. It is a tremendous problem.

If the wheat acreage is increased, as seems likely, to 75,000,000 acres, there is a possibility of the United States producing a crop of 1,200,000,000 bushels of wheat. In the marketing of this volume of wheat there is a possibility of the United States Government meeting a loss of about \$1,000,000,000 in endeavoring to market the crop in competition with the crops of the world.

It is a very serious problem, and will demand your most careful study and consideration. I am of the opinion that any legislation that is enacted to carry into effect the 1919 guaranty must be drawn with the greatest care, and I am very sure that when Mr. Hoover and Mr. Barnes return from Europe some valuable suggestions might be given to you for your consideration regarding new legislation that undoubtedly will be necessary.

I am,

Cordially, yours,

F. G. CROWELL,
Vice President.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN].

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, it has not been my pleasure to hear the speech of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE]. I understand that he discussed the failure to fix the price on cotton and the failure to lay a tax upon cotton.

I recall, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, that in 1914, when the war broke out in Europe, it so injuriously affected the price of cotton in the United States that the farmers lost 8 cents a pound. The price was 14 cents a pound when the war broke out, and it fell down to 6 cents a pound. Gentlemen, there was real suffering in the South that fall. Many a farmer had to sell

some of his live stock that he had made that crop with. He was unable then to pay his debts. Bankruptcy occurred in many instances in the South and our people suffered greatly.

I remember that the South stood here and through its representatives called upon the Government to do something to relieve that awful situation. We were only asking the Government to do something to prevent the loss that we were suffering on that crop. We argued that this condition was brought upon us not by any fault of our own, not by any natural economic cause, but that the war had an injurious effect, which reached into our country and destroyed the value of our cotton. The South lost millions of money that year. I remember my friend from Pennsylvania was one of those who said, "Gentlemen, it is unfortunate, but you will have to take your loss; it can not be helped. The Government has no business in interfering in the price of agricultural products." That was the high and holy ground the gentleman and others on that side took, as well as some gentlemen on this side.

Now this fall, when because Europe had turned her fields into food-producing lands and cotton no longer was produced in abundance in India and Egypt and Russia, and cotton was scarce and high, the gentleman wants to seize on it and keep down the price by legislative enactment. "Oh, consistency, thou art a jewel." When the farmer was crying out to us to save him from wreck and bankruptcy in 1914, caused by the war, you would not extend a helping hand to him, but then you permitted him to suffer while his cotton crop was sold below the cost of production. When the price commences to go up and he is getting back some of the losses that he sustained in 1914, these same gentlemen wanted to seize him by the throat and choke him down and destroy the value of his cotton by legislative enactment.

Let me say here that while the price is higher than in 1914 the profit on the present cotton crop is not large. When you consider the \$250 and \$300 that the cotton farmer has paid for plow mules, and the increased cost of fertilizers, agricultural implements, and labor, and, in fact, everything that enters into the cost of production, you will see that the producer is not getting a large profit when he receives 35 and 40 cents a pound for his cotton. And I want to say just here that the price of raw cotton never has been in keeping with the general run of prices on cotton goods. If cotton should bring the price to-day that the price of cotton goods generally justifies, cotton would now be selling for 75 and 80 cents per pound.

I want to say that I am opposed to the price fixing of agricultural products. We were told that it was necessary to fix the price of wheat because wheat was a food product that we had to supply our allies, and we were all together in fighting the greatest enemy of mankind. I voted to fix the price of wheat at \$2.20 and later, as gentlemen will recall, I voted to increase it to \$2.40, for I did not want the wheat producer to lose anything on his crop.

Now, in the fall elections I understand that the wheat growers in some places said you did not put it high enough, and voted against the Democratic Party for that reason. Since the Republicans have carried the House they seem to be well pleased with this price and want to hold onto it for another year, which presents a right interesting situation. Again, consistency, I say that thou art a jewel.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEFLIN. Just for a question.

Mr. SNYDER. Is it not a fact that the Democratic administration fixed this price on wheat for next year?

Mr. HEFLIN. Well, if Congress has done that, I am in favor of living up to the contract with the farmer.

Mr. SNYDER. So am I.

Mr. HEFLIN. Now, it will not do, gentlemen, to fix the price upon farm products generally. This was foodstuff deemed necessary as a war measure, but the gentleman from Pennsylvania could not with any degree of grace attempt price fixing upon cotton without favoring the fixing of a price upon the wool of those stalwart sheep in his State that climb those high and rugged hills; and in order to tax cotton, to be consistent, he must levy a tax upon the wool of the sheep, and if he does that he must put it on flax and silk—put himself in the attitude of desiring to tax all textile material. If you tax one farm product, if you are going into that business, you will tax wheat so much a bushel, corn so much a bushel; that is what you are coming to when you lay a tax on cotton—you open the way for laying a tax on every agricultural product. Of course you will. I hope the time will never come when this Government will lay a tax on farm products, and I do not think you will ever achieve that end, gentlemen, because there will always be enough men here from the grain-growing West and the cotton-producing South to prevent such a catastrophe and calamity to the farmers

of the United States. [Applause.] So that you might just as well dismiss that from your minds. But, gentlemen, I want to get all prejudice regarding cotton out of your minds. Do you know that cotton brings gold to this country when all other products fail? Cotton renders to the country a great national service every year. Cotton is the only product that goes out of this country that will unlock the vaults of foreign countries and bring gold when other products fail, and it brings more gold every year into the United States than the world's annual output. America is already the greatest cotton-producing country in the world, and I want to see her lead every other country in the manufacture and sale of cotton goods. Let the time come speedily, then, when the people of this country—East, West, North, and South—will have no semblance of prejudice against an industry of another section, but when all will look upon it as a great American industry and all working together for the good of that industry which contributes to the common good of us all. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. Sisson. The Clerk will read; I have no other requests for time.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums are appropriated out of the revenues of the District of Columbia to the extent that they are sufficient therefor and the remainder out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, but the amount to be paid from the Treasury of the United States shall in no event be as much as one-half of said expenses, in full for the following expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, except amounts to pay the interest and sinking fund on the funded debt of said District, of which amounts one half is appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated and the other half out of the revenues of the District of Columbia, namely:

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph just read.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I had intended to speak two or three minutes while the bill was under discussion. I want to say just a few words about this reconstruction that has been so much talked about, and particularly that which we hear so much in the newspapers about the distribution of those who are employed in the munition plants and those who are wearing the uniform in the various fighting branches of our country. It is my belief that so far as those who are in uniform are concerned that they will find the patriotism of their employers such that when they return home all their employers will not only be glad but anxious to see them and put them back at least on jobs equal to those that they had when they left. Of course, there is in the Army a considerable number of men who did not leave regular employment to go into the Army. Those men may have some difficulty in getting back, but in my section of the country I should feel that an employer, either little or big, who would refuse to restate the man who went to the colors, either as a volunteer or by conscription, would be almost fit for the rail or some other method of getting him out of the community, and I believe that they would practically ostracize in the community any man who would refuse to do that thing. So I feel that there is very little necessity for anxiety on our part with regard to placing in employment men who wear the uniform. I have the notion that a man who has gone to war for the purpose of making the supreme sacrifice if necessary will not feel that he should be appointed to a job or led to a job when he returns home. I believe that they will want to pick out and select their own places, and therefore I do not feel any great anxiety about the men who are returning from camps or those who are coming back from the other side.

One thing I think many men overlook with regard to the difficulty of distributing the men from our munition plants back into the ordinary economic activities of the country, and that is that practically every man who went to a munition plant went from some other job to it. And the natural thing for him to do will be to return to that job which he left. And my notion about conditions to-day and those that will prevail for the next few months, at least, is that industries that were considered nonessential during the period of the war will find it rather difficult to catch up with their requirements for many months to come, and those men who are turned out of munition plants, who desire to work for the concerns that they left, at wages such as they left or wages that have been increased since they left, which may not in every case be as high as they have been receiving in munition plants, will find very little difficulty in getting back to work. So that it is my belief that we will return to normal economic conditions during the period of reconstruction with very little financial or commercial difficulty.

The one other thing that I would like to speak about, if I had time enough, is the distribution or disposal promptly of merchandise that the various purchasing departments of the

Government find themselves to have on hand at the present time and that will come into their hands on account of contracts. I am told that there probably will not be less than a billion dollars' worth of competitive merchandise left on hand that the Government will have to find some method of disposing of. This, if thrown on the market in any one lot, or at any one time, would be, to my mind, the most destructive process of disposal that could possibly be found. And some way must be determined, in order to protect the industries of this country, for the distribution or disposal of such competitive commodities as the Government now has on hand.

Take, for instance, the question of knit underwear. I am told, and, in fact, I am nearly correct, that there are on hand to-day 125,000,000 shirts and drawers, both wool and cotton. If any such amount of goods as that were thrown on the market it would destroy the business in knit goods for at least 12 months.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five minutes more.

Mr. SNYDER. I would like five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York may proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I shall not object at this time, because many gentlemen did not have an opportunity to speak under general debate, but I want to serve notice now that I would like to have the gentlemen confine themselves to the subject matter of the bill, so we may have it passed as rapidly as possible.

Mr. SNYDER. I would be glad to do that, but I overlooked the fact that time on the bill had expired.

What applies to knit goods applies to almost everything we can think of. Take the general line of hardware. There is in the department to-day nearly \$100,000,000 worth of hardware, such as shovels, hoes, picks, hammers, axes, monkey wrenches, and things of that sort, manufactured in all parts of the country; and if, as the Government must do, these goods are thrown on the market by auction or by some other terms of sale, without very careful consideration, it would disrupt the whole business community of this country.

Now, I am as anxious as any man can possibly be to see our economic conditions go on comfortably. Of course, we can not go along continuously at the high rate of speed we have been going on during the war period, but it will be a very simple matter to throw us into confusion as manufacturers and merchants in this country if due care is not taken to dispose of these tremendous amounts of competitive merchandise that the Government has on hand and will have on hand. Now, I have suggested from a business point of view a method, and I have introduced a bill to-day which I think would help the situation considerably. My idea is that if we should dispose of 20 per cent of any item of merchandise that we may have on hand during the period of any fiscal year it would not tend to disrupt to any extent the business of the country. And, like the wheat proposition, this is one that interests the whole country, and the country could assimilate and take up \$200,000,000 of the several thousand various items that the Government will have to dispose of without interfering very much with any industry, and it would not be a great hardship for the Government to have to carry the balance for the other period of five years.

Mr. STEVENSON. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. STEVENSON. Along that line, has the gentleman made any provision in his bill for compensation for cancellation of contracts?

Mr. SNYDER. I have not. I have simply tried to cover the question of the disposal of such goods as are on hand and those that the Government may have to take by reason of its inability to cancel contracts as quickly as they desire to do.

Mr. CRISP. Has the gentleman given any consideration to the fact that the goods kept would deteriorate?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes. My measure covers only items that are not perishable.

Mr. LONDON. How about placing these goods at the disposal of the desolated regions of France?

Mr. SNYDER. My bill covers that. It does not conflict with the Government disposing of it all to-morrow outside of the United States.

That is all I have to say, gentlemen.

Mr. HEFLIN. I would like to say to the gentleman that the cotton and woolen goods that the gentleman speaks of can be disposed of outside of the United States, I am sure, to advantage.

Mr. SNYDER. I will say to the gentleman that my bill has that very item in it. My bill only affects the sale within the boundaries of the United States.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserved a point of order on the item in the first paragraph of the bill in order to obtain some information. This is the item that has provoked considerable discussion on the floor of the House in years past. Points of order have been raised against it. I rise chiefly to inquire whether this is the identical phraseology that was carried in the last year's bill, and—

Mr. Sisson. It is.

Mr. STAFFORD. And though the House voted to adhere, the House conferees were forced by the exigencies of the occasion to finally recede from?

Mr. Sisson. Yes. This was the provision which was written by the chairman of the committee some years ago, with which the gentleman is familiar. He was not at that time the chairman of the committee, but Mr. Fitzgerald asked the present chairman of the committee, after we had agreed upon what was wanted, to draw the provision, and I will say that Mr. SHERLEY drafted this provision, which has been before the House on three different occasions.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does the gentleman in charge of the bill believe that he will meet with better success this year by reason of the other body having become better acquainted with the equity and merits of the proposition by reason of the bill having been in conference a long time last summer?

Mr. Sisson. Yes. We have made a statement which we could not have made before—that we are now demanding a reduction of the revenue because the surplus in the District treasury is becoming too great.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is, it is to the advantage of the taxpayers of the District to have this adopted?

Mr. Sisson. I do not know whether it will be to their advantage, but it will not be to their disadvantage.

Mr. STAFFORD. I withdraw the reservation of the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Personal tax board: Three assistant assessors of personal taxes, at \$3,000 each; appraiser of personal property, \$1,800; clerk, \$1,400; assistant clerk, \$1,000; two inspectors, at \$1,200 each; extra clerk hire, \$2,000; intangible personal property—two clerks at \$1,500 each, five inspectors at \$1,200 each, clerk to board of personal tax assessors, \$1,800, two clerks at \$1,200 each; in all, \$30,800.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. Sisson. What is the item?

Mr. LONGWORTH. It is on the personal tax paragraph. What are the duties of these five inspectors?

Mr. Sisson. The five inspectors go out and inspect the personal property of the District. The inspection is that which finally determines the valuation of the property where there is a controversy about its value.

Mr. LONGWORTH. This is the intangible property.

Mr. Sisson. That is true.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Are they authorized to inspect men's books and their personal belongings?

Mr. Sisson. No; they are not authorized to do that. They are simply authorized to make an inspection of the returns and go back to the taxpayer and make inquiry as to whether or not a mistake has been made, or to make such investigations of the records shown by the various deeds and trusts that secure the notes, and check up accurately as to whether any of that class of property has escaped taxation. They have no inquisitorial powers, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. LONGWORTH. That was the question I wanted to ask the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For maintenance, repairs, fuel, lighting, fitting up buildings, lunch-room equipment; purchase, exchange, and maintenance of bicycles and motor delivery vehicles, and other contingent expenses, \$11,000; in all, \$29,500.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. STAFFORD. We are now coming to a very important subject, and this sparsely attended membership, I think, should not be burdened with the consideration of it.

Mr. Sisson. Where is that?

Mr. STAFFORD. On page 12.

Mr. Sisson. Very well. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and Mr. KITCHIN, as Speaker pro tempore, having resumed the chair, Mr. GARNER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 13277) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. WELTY, by unanimous consent, was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of George R. Gary (H. R. 1016, 63d Cong.), no adverse report having been made thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. LARSEN, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence for 15 days on account of important business.

POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. MOON, by direction of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, reported the bill (H. R. 13308) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, which, with the report (No. 489) thereon, was ordered printed and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

SALARIES OF REPRESENTATIVES DISCHARGED FROM MILITARY SERVICE.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table House joint resolution 358, discharge the committee to which it was referred from further action, and put it on its passage.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I suggest that the resolution be reported.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the resolution referred to a Senate resolution?

Mr. GARD. It is a House resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to discharge the committee from further consideration of House joint resolution 358 and for the immediate consideration of the same. The Clerk will report the joint resolution by title.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 358) authorizing and directing the payment of the usual compensation of Representatives in Congress to those Members of the House who have been discharged from their military or naval duties.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. STAFFORD. Let it be reported for information.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read it for information.

The joint resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to those Members of the House of Representatives of the Sixty-fifth Congress who have been serving with the military or naval forces of the United States in the recent war with Germany and her allies, compensation from and after the day of their discharge from military or naval duty at the rate provided by law for Representatives in Congress, upon the resumption and during the continuance of their duties as Representatives in Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand from the reading of this joint resolution it merely provides for the compensation of those Members of the House who have joined the military service from the date of their discharge?

Mr. GARD. Yes. There are several Members of the House, as gentlemen know, who went into the military service, and they are now returning to service in this body. This resolution provides a means of protection to the Sergeant at Arms in paying them for their services as Members of the House of Representatives when they have secured their discharge from the military service and have resumed their duties in this House.

Mr. STAFFORD. It makes no provision whatsoever for paying back salaries to those Members who have joined the military service while they were in the service?

Mr. GARD. No.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, I have heard that some gentlemen have not accepted pay while they were in the Army and have not drawn their salaries here. What provision is made for them?

Mr. GARD. None in this joint resolution.

Mr. STAFFORD. There can be no objection, as I see it, to this joint resolution, because it merely provides for the payment of their salaries from the time they resume their duties here.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Speaker, may I suggest that the word "recent" be changed to the word "present," because the war is not over?

Mr. GARD. Possibly that would be better. I have no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, that change will be made.

There was no objection.

The joint resolution as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was accordingly read the third time and passed.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

Mr. LAZARO, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled joint resolution of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. J. Res. 356. Joint resolution authorizing the payment of the salaries of officers and employees of Congress for December, 1918.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. Sisson. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, December 10, 1918, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a detailed report of the expenditures under the appropriation "Preventing the spread of epidemic diseases," for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1918 (H. Doc. No. 1562); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Alien Property Custodian, submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation required for salaries and expenses of his office for the fiscal year 1919 (H. Doc. No. 1563); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for an increase in the salary of the principal bookkeeper of the office of the Treasurer of the United States for the fiscal year 1920 (H. Doc. No. 1564); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting statement showing the number of employees and their compensation in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing whose compensation is paid from "Compensation of employees," as carried in the sundry civil bill, but who are detailed for duty in connection with clerical work of the bureau (H. Doc. No. 1565); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of communication from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, submitting supplemental estimate of appropriation required by the Department of Commerce for the fiscal year 1920 (H. Doc. No. 1566); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

6. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of communication from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, submitting supplemental estimate of appropriation required by the Department of Commerce for the fiscal year 1919 (H. Doc. No. 1567); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

7. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of communication from the Superintendent of the State, War, and Navy Department Building, submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for an assistant to the superintendent, and for increases in salaries of certain employees, for the period from December 1 to June 30, 1919 (H. Doc. No. 1568); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

8. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Northeast River, Duplin County, N. C. (H. Doc. No. 1569); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

9. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary exami-

nation of Indian and Halifax Rivers, Fla. (H. Doc. No. 1570); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed with illustration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. **POU**, from the Committee on Rules, to which was referred the resolution (H. Res. 469) providing for an investigation of the National Security League, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 844), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. **SLAYDEN**, from the Committee on the Library, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 187) providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution of the class other than Members of Congress, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 845), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. **RAKER**, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13056) to grant to citizens of Modoc County, Cal., the right to cut timber in the State of Nevada for agricultural, mining, or other domestic purposes, and to remove such timber to Modoc County, Cal., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 846), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. **SINNOTT**, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13042) providing for the extension of time for the reclamation of certain lands in the State of Oregon under the Carey Act, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 847), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. **COLLIER**, from the Committee on Ways and Means, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 5999) for the establishment of Gulfport, Miss., as a port of entry and delivery for immediate transportation without appraisement of dutiable merchandise, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 848), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. **LOBECK**: A bill (H. R. 13293) for the promotion of certain officers in the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. **GARD**: A bill (H. R. 13294) to amend an act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes, approved March 3, 1915; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. **GOULD**: A bill (H. R. 13295) to provide that all enlisted men and noncommissioned officers in the military service shall retain, when honorably discharged, their uniform and other clothing; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. **LEVER**: A bill (H. R. 13296) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish uniform standards of classification for fruits and vegetables; to provide for the use of such standards in interstate and foreign commerce; to prevent deception in reference thereto, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. **LAGUARDIA**: A bill (H. R. 13297) for the retirement of employees of the United States; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. **GRAY** of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 13298) providing for the establishment of a national railway system to coordinate and protect the respective interests therein of the Government, the public, the investor, and the employee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. **MERRITT**: A bill (H. R. 13299) making an appropriation for the improvement of the Mianus River between the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad bridge and Mianus, Conn.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. **SNYDER**: A bill (H. R. 13300) restricting the sale and disposal of certain Government supplies; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. **NEELY**: A bill (H. R. 13301) for the relief of certain noncommissioned officers of the United States Army who were recalled to active service during the recent war and commissioned as officers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. **GALLAGHER**: A bill (H. R. 13302) to increase the limit of cost for the new public-building site for the west side, Chicago, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. **MONDELL**: A bill (H. R. 13303) granting to persons honorably discharged from the military or naval forces of the United States one month's extra pay and the uniforms and apparel in their possession at the time of such discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. **WATKINS**: A bill (H. R. 13304) authorizing the appointment of a commission to codify, revise, double index, and annotate all of the laws of the United States of a permanent and general character; to the Committee on Revision of the Laws.

By Mr. **DILLON**: A bill (H. R. 13305) to permit soldiers and marines to retain the uniforms and clothing worn by them at the time of discharge and to pay them two months' extra wages; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. **SAUNDERS** of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 13306) to authorize the payment of allotments out of the pay of enlisted men in certain cases in which these payments have been discontinued; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. **MOTT**: A bill (H. R. 13307) to deport to their native countries at the conclusion of peace all enemy aliens confined in internment camps in the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. **MOON**: A bill (H. R. 13308) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes; to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. **BLAND** of Indiana: Resolution (H. Res. 470) creating a committee on war-risk insurance, soldiers' and sailors' compensation and allowances, and defining its jurisdiction; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. **IRELAND**: Resolution (H. Res. 471) to pay Charlotte Sterling, clerk to the late John A. Sterling, Representative in Congress, \$166.66; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. **RAKER**: Resolution (H. Res. 472) authorizing clerks to certain committees of the House; to the Committee on Accounts.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 473) authorizing clerk for the Committee on Woman Suffrage; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. **MONDELL**: Resolution (H. Res. 474) requesting of the Secretary of War certain information with regard to hospitals; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. **KENNEDY** of Rhode Island: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 362) requesting the plenipotentiaries of the United States at the peace conference to urge that the future government of the people of Ireland be settled by a vote of the people thereof; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. **BLAND** of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 13309) granting an increase of pension to Asa Stewart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13310) granting a pension to Alice Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13311) granting a pension to Julia Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13312) granting an increase of pension to Mathias Berry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13313) granting a pension to Frank R. Wall; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13314) granting an increase of pension to Jobe C. Walton; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. **CANNON**: A bill (H. R. 13315) granting a pension to Adellan M. Fairchild; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. **HAMILTON** of New York: A bill (H. R. 13316) granting an increase of pension to Katharine L. Cushing; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. **SNELL**: A bill (H. R. 13317) granting a pension to Charles Desmond; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. **TINKHAM**: A bill (H. R. 13318) authorizing the Treasurer of the United States to pay to Rosamond Linnette the sum of \$763.20; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. **WEAVER**: A bill (H. R. 13319) granting an increase of pension to John Early; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ESCH: Resolution of the California State Federation of Labor, in convention assembled at San Diego, Cal., October 9, 1918, indorsing the McKellar-Keating bill and urging its favorable consideration by Congress; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of Dean L. Moberley, of Streator, Ill., and Robert L. McGuire, of Earlville, Ill., protesting against tax on brokers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial adopted at a mass meeting of the citizens of Peru and La Salle, Ill., for the freedom and independence of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Resolution of the Associated Industries of Massachusetts urging amendment of the Federal tax law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TAGUE: Memorial of Division No. 72, Ancient Order of Hibernians in America, of Boston, Mass., regarding home rule for Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TINKHAM: Resolution of Division No. 72, Ancient Order of Hibernians in America, urging independence for Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. VARE: Resolutions of Rotary Club of Philadelphia for retirement of superannuated civil Government employees; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, December 10, 1918.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our great military leaders on the field of battle have recognized Thy grace to us as a people. Thy mighty arm has gained us victory, and in this place of political power, where we shape the policies of a nation, we would no less recognize Thy right to rule and our dependence upon Thy grace and Thy power. A mighty task, unspeakable in its greatness, the greatest that has ever faced, perhaps, organized society, lies just before us. Oh, do Thou give us grace, Almighty God, to meet the issues of our day and to triumph by our dependence upon Thee and by Thy divine guidance in all that pertains to the happiness and prosperity of the world. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, December 6, 1918, was read and approved.

SENATOR FROM OREGON.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I present the credentials of my colleague, Hon. FRED W. MULKEY, who has been elected for the short term by the people of Oregon as Senator. I ask that the credentials may be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The credentials will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

STATE OF OREGON,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION.

To all to whom these presents shall come, greeting:

Know ye, that it appearing from the official canvass of the vote cast at the general election held within and for the State of Oregon on Tuesday, the 5th day of November, A. D. 1918, that FRED W. MULKEY, of Multnomah County, State of Oregon, received the highest number of votes cast for the office of United States Senator in Congress at said general election:

Now, therefore, I, James Withycombe, governor of the State of Oregon, by virtue of the authority vested in me under the laws of the State of Oregon, do hereby grant this certificate of election and declare said FRED W. MULKEY, of Multnomah County, State of Oregon, to be duly elected to the office of United States Senator in Congress of the State of Oregon for the term of ----- to fill the vacancy in term ending March 4, 1919.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the State of Oregon to be hereunto affixed.

Done at the Capitol, at Salem, Oreg., this 30th day of November, A. D. 1918.

JAMES WITHYCOMBE, Governor.

By the governor:
[SEAL.]

BEN W. OLCOTT,
Secretary of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the credentials? The Chair hears none, and they will be placed on file.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I ask that the oath be administered to Mr. MULKEY, who is present.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The newly elected Senator will present himself at the desk for the purpose of taking the oath of office.

Mr. MULKEY was escorted to the Vice President's desk by Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, and the oath prescribed by law having been administered to him he took his seat in the Senate.

SENATOR FROM IDAHO.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. President, I present the credentials of my colleague, Hon. WILLIAM E. BORAH, which I ask to have read and placed on file.

The credentials were read and ordered to be filed, as follows:

STATE OF IDAHO—CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION.

To all to whom these presents shall come, greeting:

Whereas the Board of Canvassers of the State of Idaho, as provided in section 453 of the Revised Codes, having duly canvassed, declared, and certified on the 25th day of November, A. D. 1918, to the secretary of state that at a general election held in said State on the 5th day of November, A. D. 1918, WILLIAM E. BORAH received the greatest number of legal votes cast at said election for the office of United States Senator and is therefore elected to such office.

Now, therefore, I, W. T. Dougherty, secretary of state of the State of Idaho, do certify that WILLIAM E. BORAH is elected to the office of United States Senator in and for the State of Idaho for the period of six years commencing the 4th day of March, A. D. 1919, and ending the 4th day of March, A. D. 1925, as appears by the records in my office.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Idaho. Done at Boise, the capital of said State, this 25th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1918, and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and forty-third.

[SEAL.]

W. T. DOUGHERTY,
Secretary of State.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The Judiciary Committee, by direction of the Senate, is investigating the subject of German propaganda work in this country during the war. On Saturday before that committee certain evidence was produced by Mr. Bielaski and my name was so referred to as to justify me in making a brief comment.

The evidence in question consisted of a letter dated July 22, 1915, signed "Reiswitz," and sent to some one whom he addressed as "Your Excellency." We are told that Reiswitz was then the German consul at Chicago. His letter appears to give the so-called "excellency" information concerning a German movement in this country to stop the export of arms and ammunition. This movement was known as the Embargo Conference. In this letter Reiswitz mentions my name in the following paragraph:

Among others, the following have agreed to cooperate: Senator HITCHCOCK, Congressman Buchanan, William Bayard Hale, of New York, and the well-known pulpit orator, Dr. Aked (born an Englishman), from San Francisco.

Hitchcock seems to be very strong for the plan. He told our representative at a conference in Omaha, "If this matter is organized in the right way, you will sweep the United States."

If his alleged "excellency" or Reiswitz himself had any intelligence, either or both of them must have known that I was myself the author of the bill to prohibit the export of arms and ammunition and that I had introduced it in the Senate more than eight months before the Reiswitz letter was written. They must have known that I had made a Senate speech upon it and that it had been debated in the Senate and discussed in the newspapers. They must have known that on February 17, 1915, I had offered my bill as an amendment to the shipping bill then pending and that my amendment had been defeated by a vote of 36 to 51. My position, therefore, in favor of prohibiting the export of arms and ammunition had been independently and publicly taken and was widely known months before Reiswitz discovered it and revealed it to his chief as a secret.

The part I took during 1914 and 1915 in favor of prohibiting the export of arms and ammunition during our neutrality has never been a subject of concealment or apology on my part. It became a campaign issue in 1916 when I ran for reelection, and the fact that I was reelected by a comfortable majority indicates that my course and my motives were understood and approved by the people of Nebraska.

My stand was taken in 1914 as an American for neutrality. The Germans in America took theirs by forming the Embargo Conference in 1915 as partisans of Germany. They were supporting my bill, but I declined to go to their conferences, conventions, or meetings, though I was often invited to appear as a speaker. I made my only speeches here in the Senate or in defending my course later before my constituents.

In those days, Mr. President, the country was under a pledge of neutrality by virtue of the President's proclamation made when the war broke out. We should, no doubt, have remained neutral, at least nominally and officially, if Germany had not by a series of outrages made our attitude first difficult and then impossible.

My attitude naturally changed with changing conditions.